Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

JANUARY, 1919

THE OLD YEAR AND THE NEW

NEVER before within our recollection have the American people been so fully warranted as now in confronting a New Year with the confidence begotten of faith in the great Republic. Never have they been more firmly knit together in mind and soul. Never have their feet been placed more fixedly upon the solid foundations of popular sovereignty. Never were their heads higher, their vision clearer, their prospects brighter. Well, indeed, as with Hezekiah of old, may their hearts be lifted up in joyful anticipation!

We laugh at the doles of dolts who foresee disaster in embarrassment of riches. Grant that we have problems, difficult and grave, to solve! Have we not the wherewithal in men and money? In spirit purified by flame? In wisdom born of seeing? In courage sprung from gallant deeds performed? In unity? In singlemindedness? In mutual understanding?

Surely no land ever leaped so quickly into comprehension of itself as this of ours in the year now drawing to a close. A short twelvemonth ago a Gulliver bound seemingly fast by official Lilliputians, sluggish, fat, incapable, derided; today, the fetters broken, a giant among nations, erect, alert, efficient, respected, ennobled by its baptism of fire, its sacrifices, its generosity, its fidelity to truth, its devotion to humanity! Assuredly a transformation of humans worthy of the gods! . . . . A wonderful, wonderful year!

It has been much more than a four years' war. We may omit prologue, preface, foreword, introduction; the generations of prenatal poisoning of the twentieth century Hun.

Copyright, 1918, by NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW CORPORATION. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even so, we must date not the origin but the organization of Germany's design to achieve the conquest of the world at January 18, 1871, nearly forty-eight years ago. The place was the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, in the palace of the old French kings, conquered and occupied by the invading Germans. The occasion was the proclamation of William von Hohenzollern, King of Prussia, as "Deutsches Kaiser," thus recreating the Germanic empire under the autocratic headship of the successor of the most ruthless of those old robber barons who waged war solely for pillage and for conquest. Forty days later, lacking one, an earnest of the predatory purpose of the new empire was given in the demand that France, as a penalty for being beaten, surrender to the Hunnish conqueror two provinces and one billion dollars in gold. With that the war was on: The Hun against humanity.

"Go forth, my son," said Oxenstiern, "and see with how little wisdom the world is governed." With how little vision men regard the progress of affairs was shown in that civilized peoples, our own among them, largely applauded the rise of the Hohenzollern empire as auspicious of peace and progress in the world.

The next significant date was that of June 15, 1888. On that day William the Damned succeeded to the Prussian and German thrones.

There followed a quarter century of such hypocrisy, intrigues and insidious aggression as the world never before had known; so shrewdly camouflaged that down to the very end it deceived the vast majority of the unvisioned world. In all sobriety and mature advisement it may be estimated that if a poll of humanity had been obtainable at any time before midsummer of 1914, a vast majority of mankind would have expressed confidence in the German Emperor and in the German Empire as pacific in purpose and as an irenic bulwark of the world. A few voices were raised in warning, here and there; only to be decried and condemned like that of Laocoon. It is to be remembered grimly that responsible British statesmen threatened to deprive Lord Roberts of his pension if he did not refrain from urging the need of preparation for defence against a German attack. "Go forth, my son; and see with how little vision the world is governed."

At Serajevo, in a province which Austria had stolen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and held subject, an Austrian subject assassinated the Heir Presumptive to the Austrian throne, on June 29, 1914. The unvisioned world regarded that as nothing but one of the not unusual incidents in the business of sovereignty; not being awakened even by the indications that the tragedy had been half anticipated at Vienna and Berlin, and was regarded at those capitals with satisfaction ill concealed behind pretensions of official wrath. But nearly a month later, on July 24, came the awakening shock of an Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, couched in terms of such insolent arrogance as the world had not heard before. There were a few days of agitated diplomacy, the purport of which was not even yet appreciated by the half-awakened world; ending on August 1 with Germany's declaration of war against Russia, and her invasion of Luxemburg and ultimatum to Belgium preparatory to her attack upon France.

The storm had broken. In what plight did it find the world? "Never for one moment," writes Professor John Bach McMaster, "had Germany intended to keep the peace." There is documentary proof that before the assassination at Serajevo the German Government took steps toward beginning war that very summer, and that early in July, more than a fortnight before the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, the definite decision for the war was made in Berlin. In consequence, Germany began the war in the completest possible state of preparation. All others, France, Russia, Great Britain, were unprepared and were taken by surprise, with a single exception. The British fleet was ready; and it saved the world. Indeed, all still unrealized by the majority of mankind, the world had within a few weeks triple salvation. The British fleet held the high seas against the Hun. The little Belgian army at Liège and the little British army at Mons, by courting self-destruction delayed the onrush of the Hunnish hordes for the few days needed to enable some little preparation on the part of France. And then France, with British aid, achieved the Miracle of the Marne. Thereafter through weary years the Allies held the line for freedom and humanity, until America should enter by their side.

What of America? Our annals bear no more astounding chapters than those which tell of our early attitude toward the war; our persistent unpreparedness; our purposed blindness to the issues and to the menace; our astound-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing tolerance of the enemy within our gates; the puerile pretence that we should be neutral in thought as well as in word and deed, and should not so much as concern ourselves to know what the war was all about; our indifference to the rape of Belgium, to the scrapping of treaties and international law; our national echoing of the pseudo-exculpatory demand of the world's first murderer, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Even the *Lusitania* massacre, away back on May 7, 1915, failed to rouse us from the lethargic obsession of keeping out of war. "Go forth, my son, and see with how little vision the world is governed."

But the crisis had to come at last. It was on February 3, 1917, that diplomatic relations were severed with Germany, and that the treacherous criminal who had made the German Embassy at Washington the centre of hostile plots against the United States, was sent home to his master. Two months later the climax was reached. On April 2 the President recommended and on April 6 Congress voted recognition of the state of war which Germany had long before practically instituted against us. But not yet was the nation fully awake. The unpreparedness of years, the happy-go-lucky habits of thought and action, the sordidness of many, and even the potential treason of not a few, hampered and all but hamstrung the nation as it struggled to arise to its vital needs. There was an army to be created. There were rifles and cannon and airplanes and what not to be manufactured. There was the whole industrial and commercial system of the nation to be reorganized on a war basis. And all had to be done in the face of pacifism in high places and Bolshevism in low places.

It was done. But it was done with agonizing slowness, while those who had for three years been our defenders and our saviors stood with their backs to the wall in a last desperate resolve to do or die. After the formal declaration of war it was nearly seven months, it was October 27, before the first shot was fired at the foe by Americans under the American flag at the war front. It was a week later, on November 3, that the first American lives, under the American flag were sacrificed in the great war that democracy and civilization might live. Enright, Gresham, Hay: Let their names be held in everlasting remembrance.

Even then our war dragged wearily. The official head of our military establishment regarded it as three thousand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miles away and therefore as not demanding any specially energetic or expeditious efforts. Not until we had been engaged in it all but a year did we begin to make our presence really felt. It was on March 21, 1918, that the Battle of Picardy, the Beginning of the End, began; and one week later General Pershing placed under Marshal Foch's command all the American forces then in France. They were not many, but they counted; and thereafter their numbers were swiftly swelled, as the " bridge of ships," protected by the British fleet and by our own, bore an incessant stream of American soldiers flowing eastward, ever eastward. The summer saw scenes of glory: Belleau Wood, Chateau-Thierry, the second Marne, the St. Mihiel salient; until American guns were thundering at the walls of Metz, and from the Alps to the Silver Streak the " long battle came rolling on the foe." At the beginning of November there were 750,000 American soldiers fighting in the Argonne, and a million more behind their lines. On the morning of November 11, 1918, the Day of Days in the world's modern history, the United States had in France 78,391 officers and 1,881,376 men.

On that day, Germany surrendered.

It had cost us approximately 55,000 men killed and 180,000 wounded and missing; lighter losses by far than even little Belgium or Serbia suffered. Great Britain's casualties were more than thirty times as great as ours—3,049,991, of whom 658,665 were killed outright. French casualties were 2,719,642, of whom 559,612 were killed. The losses of Germany are still largely a matter of estimate. Well informed and conservative reckoning puts the total in killed, wounded and prisoners at nearly if not quite 7,000,000, of whom at least 1,800,000 were killed. The money cost of the war to all the belligerents has thus far been approximately $200,000,000,000, or fifty times that of our Civil War. Of this cost probably one-eighth has fallen upon the United States, and by the time the treaty of peace is signed and all our troops are brought back home, our expense account will probably equal thirty billions.

A stupendous cost, that, in life and treasure; from one point of view to gratify the insane ambition of a criminal paranoiac, from another to abolish the fiction of " divine right " and to confirm forever the rights of man. Are they confirmed forever? We shall see what answer the Peace

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conference essays to make to that question. "Go forth, my son, and see with what wisdom the world applies its greatest and its costliest lesson."

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE

SCARCELY any phase of the post-bellum situation in Central Europe is more auspicious than the impending dissolution of the German and Austro-Hungarian empires and the formation in their stead of a more or less numerous group of separate states. We refer now not to the creation of independent states from the non-Teutonic and non-Magyar peoples long held in bondage, but to the division of Teutonic Germany and perhaps of Austria, too, into such commonwealths. Such a consummation is devoutly to be desired, for generous as well as for retributive and prudential reasons.

Without mere exultation over the internecine quarrels among our enemies, however, there is this serious and important cause for gratification, that the dissolution of the German Empire abates the chief menace to the peace of the world. We must now recognize the fact, which formerly we tried so hard not to perceive, that from the very beginning that empire meant war. It had its origin in war. The war was provoked and fought for the sake of forming the empire, and then reciprocally the empire was formed and maintained for the sake of war. It is aggressive war of conquest and rapacity, too, with which the empire and before it the Prussian kingdom have been intimately and inseparably identified. We must bear in mind the historic fact that every war waged by Prussia or by the empire of which Prussia has been the head, from the time of Frederick miscalled the Great to the present has been a war deliberately and treacherously begun by that Power for the sake of seizing a neighbor's territory or exacting tribute, or both.

It is an interesting historical fact that Prussia, or the Hohenzollerns, did not seek and indeed would not accept the headship of the German Empire until that kingdom had grown so strong as to be able completely to dominate that organization. We must remember that away back in 1848 the German people through their chosen representatives offered the imperial crown to the King of Prussia, and that he declined it. Why? For two reasons. One was that the offer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came from the people and therefore if he had accepted it he would have been recognizing the right of the people to select their own rulers. He preferred to wait until he, or his successor, could take the crown without reference to the people, and could claim a " divine right." The other reason was, that Prussia was not yet big enough and strong enough to dominate the empire. He preferred to wait until in a couple of wars waged for the purpose Prussia could be aggrandized by the annexation of the Danish Provinces, Hanover, part of Saxony, and various other states, so that " German Empire " would be merely a euphemism for " Greater Prussia." It is interesting to recall that the then King of Prussia was the crowned criminal who distinguished himself with the official dictum: " All written constitutions are only scraps of paper "; thus giving to his last successor the cue for applying to international treaties the same contemptuous epithet.

But we must not blind ourselves to the great achievements of Germans in past generations and the immense contributions which they have made to human knowledge, human progress and human pleasure. But neither must we forget the fact that these things were done, and the great men who performed them were born and flourished, during the ages when there was a German Empire in name only, and when the Teutonic race was divided into a multitude of small states. Petty and contemptible as were those Dukedoms and Principalities from a military or political point of view, they developed culture, they developed men of spiritual vision, they achieved those deeds which caused it to be said that while France (under Napoleon) ruled the empire of the land and England (under Nelson and his successors) the empire of the sea, God had given to Germany the empire of the air—that is, of the mind and spirit. But those days passed with the coming of the empire.

The last of the true intellectual and spiritual leaders of Germany disappeared at the middle of the last century; some dying and leaving no successors, others fleeing from the hardening hand of despotism and finding refuge in America, where many of them contributed an element of sterling worth to our mixed population. Not in threescore years has Germany produced one great spirtual leader or indeed one great and free intellectual leader. Her achievements in material science, industry and commerce have indeed been enormous; yet in them she has chiefly appropriated and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adopted as her own the inventions and discoveries of others, her own original work and initiative being contemptibly small. We venture to hope that, freed from the deadly incubus of the sordid, predatory and despotic Hohenzollern empire, the German mind and soul will have "a new birth of freedom" and will measurably regain that former high estate which once made them no small part of the light of the world. If so, the dissolution of the Empire will be no less beneficent to the Germans themselves than to the rest of the world which it frees from the menace of further attempts at conquest.

But whatever is done will not and cannot alter to the extent of one iota the relations between Germany and the rest of the world arising out of the war, nor lessen by so much as the small dust in the balance the responsibility of Germany for the crimes against international law and against humanity that have been committed. The indictment rests, and the judgment will stand, against Germany as it existed at the beginning of and through the war. It will make no difference whether Germany remains a unit as an empire or a republic, or is dissolved into a number of separate states. The penalty of the war must be paid just the same. No state can escape its share by seceding from the empire, any more than the Kaiser could escape responsibility by absconding and abdicating.

Nor can any German state or any part of the German people by leaving and repudiating the empire establish any valid claim to moral sympathy or to rehabilitation in the esteem of mankind. We may recognize a difference between Bavaria and Prussia in favor of the former; we may agree that the Bavarian Government in charging the Imperial Government with lying at the outbreak of the war; and we may regard with approval and with hope the withdrawal of Bavaria and other states from the empire, if they do withdraw. The damning fact remains, however, that Bavaria and all the rest stood firmly with Prussia in the empire during the war; that the Bavarian Government was privy to and acquiesced in the Prussian lies which it now denounces; that Bavaria and all the German states shared willingly in the war and shared eagerly in its loot; and that not one of them would have thought of withdrawing from the empire if the empire had been victorious in the war. So too Hungary stood with Austria in the war, and would have stood with her to the end if Austria had been successful.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We shall welcome the disappearance of the despotic and militaristic German Empire and the rise of a group of free and independent German states, and we shall hope that thus the Germany of the Hohenzollerns and Bernhardis and Tirpitzes and Hindenburgs will be transformed into the Germany of Goethe and Schiller and Lessing and Richter. But the former is the Germany with which we have practically to deal, and we shall deal with it inexorably, regardless of whether it mends its ways or remains incorrigible and contumacious in its sins. Repentance might indeed command consideration and commutation of sentence if our policy toward Germany were merely punitive. But it is not. It is not intended to demand one cent of punitive fine, but merely reparatory indemnity. The purpose is to restore the victim, not to punish the criminal, and that purpose cannot be balked in any degree by any eleventh hour reformation on the part of Germany or of any of its members. On the contrary, we must hold it to be essential, in order to make Germany's repentance real and worthy of recognition, that she "bring forth fruits meet for repentance"; and such fruits must comprise not merely renunciation of the criminal empire but also payment of the fullest possible indemnity for the empire's crimes.

ARE WE TO HAVE A "REPTILE PRESS"?

THE question should be uncalled for. It should be so superfluous as to be offensive. But it has been forced upon us by recent incidents and utterances in a way which it is impossible to ignore. Hint after hint has been given, step after step has been taken, until at last the culmination is seemingly reached in the direct suggestion—from a source which we are not prepared to identify but which was certainly not devoid of plausibility—of the organization of an "official press." Are we, then, to have a "reptile press" as the consummate flower of a paternal government?

We cannot ignore the significance of the President's action more than two years ago, when he abandoned the long established and salutary practice of giving collective interviews to the representatives of the press in Washington. His predecessors had been glad to show themselves to the assembled correspondents, sometimes as often as every day, and to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say a few words upon matters of public interest; and even on some occasions to talk at length personally with individual correspondents. But in the very midst of the Great War, at a time when our own relations with Germany were becoming so strained that our entry into the war became daily more probable, and when a single phrase or word from the President would have been of inestimable interest, he shut himself absolutely away from all contact with the men upon whom the nation had to depend for information concerning the progress of public affairs, and a little later ceased to receive individual newspaper men. We have it upon the authority of that writer who is perhaps his most earnest advocate and most ardent defender against hostile criticism, that not once since May, 1916, has the President met correspondents collectively, and that not once in the past year has he received one of them individually.

This attitude of aloofness cannot be attributed to any reluctance toward publicity, since the President has repeatedly assured us that a desire for the fullest possible publicity for all governmental business is one of the dominant passions of his life. Neither can it be explained on the ground of lack of time, for he has often been engaged in trivialities at the very hour when such a meeting with correspondents would have been most desirable. There remains, then, the explanation which has been given by his journalistic eulogist already quoted, to wit, that he does not think the people are—or, shall we say, ought to be?—interested in public affairs. For we are explicitly told that he refuses to consider the activities of the press as manifestations of the desire of the people for information on public affairs, but rather of the mere idle curiosity of individual reporters.

There may be, also, this explanation of an explanation, that he thinks that the people ought to be satisfied with the creelings which are officially emitted from the Committee of Public Information, and ought not to ask more. We remember that at about the time when he adopted the policy of shutting himself away from newspaper men the President, deliberately discussing the war which had then been going on for nearly two years, declared that " With its causes and objects we are not concerned. The obscure fountains from which its stupendous flood has burst forth we are not interested to search for or explore." Perhaps he applied that same rule to the public in its attitude toward his adminis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tration and its policies; holding that with them it was not concerned, and that it should not search or explore beyond the boundaries of the "Official Bulletin" provided by his creel.

The unfortunate impressions which were inevitably produced by this course of the President were recently much deepened by two almost simultaneous incidents, of official origin. One of these was the sudden and unexpected taking over by the Administration of the various transoceanic cables and wireless telegraph systems. This was done, of course, as a war measure. It could not have been done otherwise. Yet it was not done until the President himself had assured us that the war was ended. There had apparently been no need of it during many months of strenuous warfare, when need of most cautious supervision of all means of communication with Europe was plausibly manifest. But as soon as the enemy surrendered and the armistice was signed, the President, or his Politicalmaster General, perceived a most imperative need for it. It may, of course, have been the purest coincidence, absolutely accidental, that it was just at that time that the President decided to go to Europe to impress his policies upon the Peace Conference. It may be that between the two there was not the slightest relationship. But this is an incredulous and skeptical world, containing many former residents of Missouri.

The other incident was the sending of Mr. George Creel and his staff abroad to be in Paris during the President's visit and during the sessions of the Peace Congress. There was an instant and natural assumption, which we cannot regard as either extravagant or unwarranted, that this Committee on Public Information was to exercise some sort of censorship, control or supervision over the transmission of news to this country. If not, indeed, why should Mr. Creel go over there at all? True, it has since been announced that there will be no censorship and no bar on news. Official government business will have the first place for transmission; news will stand second; and commercial and miscellaneous business will come last. That is as it should be. Yet we assume that messages sent by Mr. Creel, as of the Committee on Public Information, will be classed as official business and will thus have the preference over mere newspaper correspondence; and we can imagine a possibility of his having so much to send at a given time that press matter would be badly delayed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is further announced that " the machinery of the Committee on Public Information will be used entirely to facilitate the work of the American newspaper representatives in Paris." If, for example, the Congress should decide to hold its meetings in secret, excluding the correspondents, Mr. Creel might, as a sort of *ex officio* member of the Congress, serve as the medium through which accounts of its doings, " elaborated " in his well known and justly esteemed style, might leak out to the otherwise baffled pressmen. For such service the representatives of what he calls " nasty newspapers " would doubtless be most grateful. Even our Congress would rejoice to get its news of the peace-making deliberations by the grace of the courteous gentleman who publicly likened its heart and mind to slums.

We repeat that this train of incidents, colored throughout by the attitude of the President himself, irresistibly and quite warrantably provokes wonderment as to whether the Socialistic and paternal policy of the Administration, in addition to Government ownership of railroads, ships, telegraphs, telephones, coal and iron and copper mines, oil wells, water power, forest, and Heaven knows what not, comprises also government control of the newspaper press. If so, more than ever we demur. The American people demur to any proposal for a " reptile press." It was not for nothing that the founders of the Republic placed the freedom of the press among the fundamental principles upon which the nation is based; and we do not believe that the nation to-day is any more minded to abandon that principle than it is to abandon trial by jury or the electoral franchise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENTENTE OF FREE NATIONS

BY DAVID JAYNE HILL

In every period of warfare since modern nations came into existence, there have been serious reflections upon the cost and the horrors of war which have culminated in schemes for preventing it altogether. Some of these have been merely abstract theories regarding the manner in which international conflicts could be obviated or rendered impossible; while others have been of a more pragmatic character, aiming to create in the realm of actuality a situation which would safeguard the interests of peace and possibly of justice.

Among the devices of a purely theoretical order, one of the most notable, suggested by the struggle between the House of Hapsburg with the rest of Europe, was the "Great Design" which the Duke of Sully, in 1634, attributed to Henry IV of France, but which it is now clearly established was not conceived by that monarch and appears to have been invented by the fallen minister himself as a means of procuring his own recall to the administration of the affairs of his country. All Europe, according to this plan, was to be organized into fifteen states, which together should constitute one Christian Republic in which wars were to be prevented by a General Council, composed of forty delegates, meeting annually in the most central cities of the different countries in rotation. The Thirty Years' War, which was ended by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 had already elicited Emeric Crucé's *Nouveau Cynée,* written in 1623, in which the Republic of Venice was proposed as a place where a permanent corps of ambassadors should reside and by their votes settle all international affairs. Hugo Grotius, perceiving that such settlements could not be made except upon the basis of previously accepted rules or principles, in 1625 had given the world his *De Jure Belli ac Pacis,* the first con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siderable treatise on the Law of Nations; and to this he had added the proposal of " some kind of body in whose assemblies the quarrels of each one might be terminated by the judgment of others not interested ", and that " means be sought to constrain the parties to agree to reasonable conditions." In like manner, the Peace of Utrecht, in 1713, was accompanied by the elaborate *Projet de la Paix Perpétuelle* of the Abbé Saint-Pierre, in which he proposed the formation of a universal alliance of sovereigns to secure them against the misfortunes of war by abolishing the separate use of force, perfecting their laws, and submitting their differences to judicial decision; with a provision that a refractory sovereign who violated a treaty or refused to accept a judgment, should be brought to terms by the others arming against him and charging to his account the expense of the operation. The Napoleonic Wars also brought their contribution of plans for international peace, the most conspicuous effort being that of Immanuel Kant, in 1796, in his essay on " Eternal Peace ", in which the solution offered by this Prussian philosopher was that all states should become republican in form; a condition, as he thought, which would enable them by some kind of general federation to unite their forces for the preservation of peace.

It is not surprising, therefore, that, as a result of the defeat of the aggressors in the Great War now, as we hope, happily terminated by the united efforts of a group of advanced and liberal nations, these plans, or modifications of them, should again receive attention, and that a general desire should be created for " some kind of body ", as Grotius expressed the aspiration, which could prevent the repetition of the experience through which the world has passed.

What was impossible before the Great War, it is believed by many, could be easily accomplished now; and that, therefore, even before a peace is finally concluded, and as an essential part of it and a condition of its perpetuity, a " League of Nations " should be formed.

There are, it is true, wide differences of opinion regarding the objects, the methods, the organization, and the obligations of such a league, varying from the creation of a World State by the federation of the existing nations into one vast political organism including all, both small and great, to a limited compact confined to a few Powers with no function beyond the peaceable adjudication of differences by an inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national tribunal without power to enforce its judgments.

The occasion is, no doubt, opportune for a thorough discussion of these widely differing plans, and it is timely for their advocates to express their views and support their conceptions by argument; but it is by no means to be taken for granted that any one of these projects, however honestly and earnestly its supporters may believe it should be at once adopted, is either practicable or desirable. The stress of insistence should not be placed upon the means of forcing the acceptance of a particular plan, however meritorious it may be in itself, but upon the intelligent comparison of different plans and a patient examination of their probable effects.

It is not the intention here to discuss exhaustively any special plan, much less to propose one, but to direct attention to the course of procedure most likely to secure the ends which are in the minds of all who entertain convictions upon this subject.

That which needs, first of all, to be emphasized is, that no one Power can expect, or should desire, to impose upon others a system which they do not all heartily approve; and, in the next place, that if any plan is to be permanent and effective, it must have the support not only of the leading governments but of the great masses of the people whom those governments represent. It is, therefore, greatly to be desired that the public should be fully informed before any decisive step is taken, that nothing should be urged until it is well understood, and that no theorist, however competent and trusted, should be regarded as a trustee of a whole people in a matter of such import and consequence. The true principle that should be invoked for guidance in this matter was well and forcibly enunciated by the President of the United States when, in 1912, in his first electoral campaign, he dwelt upon the value of " common counsel ", and, as one of the people, seeking leadership, expressed his attitude regarding public policies in the words: " I am one of those who absolutely reject the trustee theory, the guardianship theory. I have never found a man who knew how to take care of me, and, reasoning from that point out, I conjecture that there isn't any man who knows how to take care of all the people of the United States. I suspect that the people of the United States understand their own interests better than any group of men in the confines of the country understand them."

It may, of course, be thought that it is not the " interests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the people of the United States" that should prevail in the formation of an organization so general as a "League of Nations", but the interests of humanity. This may be true, but the "trustee theory, the guardianship theory", is perhaps even less applicable to humanity as a whole than it is to a single people, who in ordinary circumstances may at least have an opportunity to choose, and to some extent direct, their trustee or guardian.

It would, however, be a fatal error to overlook the fact that the interests of the people of the United States, as well as the interests of other portions of humanity, are deeply involved in any plan to form a "League of Nations". Great benefits might accrue, or serious disadvantages might result from occupying a place in it. It is the duty of the people as well as the statesmen of the nations that may enter into such a league, to consider for themselves the alleged benefits and the possible disadvantages; and this, speaking generally, they will, no doubt, do. It will be done in Great Britain, in France, in Italy, and in Japan,—to mention only a few of the co-belligerents,—and their interests, which will be different, will be carefully considered. The signs of this are evident to those who are familiar with the contemporary comments of the European press upon this subject, especially the great British quarterlies, which have already discussed the "League of Nations" with a candor, a seriousness, and an understanding that have not been equalled by American periodicals of the same class, which have inclined to take the complimentary speeches of Lloyd George, Lord Grey, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Balfour as a complete and authoritative expression of British opinion, but this is far from being the case.

No discussion of the subject has been published in America to compare in amplitude of knowledge and solidity of judgment with the treatment of it under the title "The Greatest League of Nations", by Lord Sydenham of Combe, in the August number of *The Nineteenth Century and After,* which concludes: "We shall not win the war by planning Leagues of Peace to meet circumstances which we cannot yet foresee. Like the paper constitutions of Sieyés they may prove impracticable; but the Holy Alliance against the forces of evil remains, and when it is crowned with victory it can be turned into a powerful agency for maintaining the peace of the world. Then, in some happier future, the vision of Isaiah may be fulfilled, and 'Nation shall not lift up sword

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against nation; neither shall they learn war any more'."

Nor has anything appeared in the American periodicals so searching and so well informed as the article by J. B. Firth, under the title "The Government and the League of Nations", in *The Fortnightly Review* for September. He points out that the British Government some months ago appointed "a very well chosen Committee",—as Mr. Balfour described it,—"on which international law and history were powerfully represented", to examine and report on a "League of Nations". "The report has been drawn up, but its contents have not been divulged. Neither Lord Curzon nor Mr. Balfour alluded to it; they did not even say that it had been considered by the War Cabinet. By a curious coincidence the same official reticence is being observed in France. There, too, an authoritative Commission, presided over by M. Bourgeois, was appointed by the Government, and issued its report last January; but it has not been published in France, and, according to Lord Curzon, no copy of it had reached the British Government on June 26th. Why this secretiveness, both in London and Paris? If there had been practical unanimity in favor of the project there could be no reason for reserve."

There is, no doubt, however, an excellent reason for this discreet silence. It is the desire of the officials of both England and France not to wound the sensibilities of the Americans, who are credited with being the sponsors of the "League of Nations". The British leaders, always without definition, but in a fine spirit of courtesy, have taken up the watchword, a "League of Nations",—for it is so far nothing more,—and Lord Curzon has been able to say in the House of Lords, that opinion in England in favor of the League was "rather in advance of the opinion of any of our Allies save the United States"; and he added, that "if the British Government went ahead too quickly, or too abruptly, there was danger of a rebuff." As a confirmation of this danger, Mr. Firth remarks, that, "although the report of the French Commission has not been published, it is an open secret that its judgment was adverse to any proposal for establishing an international force which shall be always ready to enforce the decisions of the League upon a recalcitrant member."

In an admirable historic summary, Mr. Firth illustrates with instances the tedious wrangling in the so-called Concert

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Europe over the simplest and most necessary forms of co-operative action, and asks: "How can these idealists talk airily about the establishment of an international army or the dispatch of an international expedition to deal with an aggressor against the 'League of Nations', when they see how long it has taken Japan and the United States to come to an understanding on the subject of joint action in Siberia? Every hour was of priceless value . . . Yet days and weeks were suffered to slip by for political reasons which are perfectly well known and thoroughly understood. Will it be any different when there is a 'League of Nations'?"

A passage as instructive to Americans as it is characteristic of English thought is found in the October number of *The English Review,* in which its editor, Austin Harrison, illustrates what he conceives to be a general principle by what he regards as a conspicuous example. "There is and can be no such thing", he says, "as democratic government, as loosely understood; for every democracy is controlled by an oligarchy, whether of intellect, of interest, or of mere popularity, and the purer the democracy the greater would seem to be the authority of its oligarchy, as we have all seen in the astonishing singleness, discipline, and elasticity of the heterogeneous masses of America at war under what is nothing less than the sovereign will of the President. It is this acceptance of oligarchical authority in America that differentiates the democracy of the New World from that of the Old, as particularly exemplified in Britain. Take the case of conscription, which in America became law overnight, though three thousand miles of sea divided America from the theatre of the war, and in no case was any motive put forward for war but that of principle. Here it took us two years, because our democracy does not accept its oligarchy, does not recognize acquiescence, is intellectually and traditionally antagonized by the very idea of authority, whether of government or opportunity."

It is true that the people of the United States have been singularly united and singularly obedient to leadership, but the comment fails to find a true interpretation of the fact. This nation has never bowed to "the sovereign will of the President". It has respected the voice of individual conscience. It beheld in the conduct of Germany an inexpressible wrong of gigantic proportions. It shuddered, but it did not hesitate to judge or condemn. Millions, tens of mil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lions, of men in America wanted to fight Germany when the will of the President was not yet for war, and chafed under the neutrality of their Government. Thousands of our young men went to Canada and to France, in order to help in defeating Germany before any " sovereign will " had expressed itself in the United States. Here was a peaceful nation that did not want peace, but victory; a nation that would have accused and cursed itself if it had not been allowed to fight. The " oligarchy ", if there be one, responded to the " sovereign will " of an aroused people, not to the leadership of a President. It adhered to him in war, not because he commanded it, but because it had commanded him. There is the explanation of conscription. It was, indeed, based on a " principle "; but the principle was not a governmental enunciation, it was a deep-seated and almost universal declaration of the national mind.

It took England, Mr. Harrison says, " two years to adopt conscription, because English democracy does not accept its oligarchy ". In the result the advantage is with England. It took us much more than two years to prepare for war, because our oligarchy did not appeal to its democracy.

The error of this brilliant writer regarding our "oligarchy " and its influence has led him more seriously astray on some other points. Without our intervention, he thinks, the Great War would have had to be settled on the principle of " the balance of power ",—a peace without a victory; and from this he argues that " the message of America is democracy, her mission is union ". America is thus held responsible for proposing a " League of Nations ". We have been fighting, he thinks, " not Germany; not, in the historical sense, the Germans; but the German idea of mastery, the German feudal system, the Kultur of imperial and dynastic ambition. America is thus fighting against the attitude of the balance of power ".

This is a total misapprehension, which proves how inadequately British perception has comprehended our real motives as a people, and how insufficiently we have thus far expressed them. It assumes that we have been fighting for " fourteen points " of European and world reconstruction; and that the success of those, including a " League of Nations ", was what we have had in mind. There is probably not one soldier or even one officer in the American Army, either in the field or at home, who ever thought for a moment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he, or his country, was carrying on this war " against the attitude of the balance of power ", or to establish a " League of Nations ". Not one in a hundred thousand ever dreamed that the war had anything to do with " the balance of power "; and few would have known what it meant if it were suggested to them. They were fighting *the Germans,* because the Germans were brutalizing mankind, violating international law, and destroying people's homes. And there is not a man of them who would not fight again for the same reason.

We do not wish to be misunderstood in Europe by the representation that we went into this war with the purpose, or for the end, of creating a " League of Nations." We have not, as a people, studied the project. We do not all even know what it is. There are many full-fledged and very ingenious schemes for a " League of Nations " which palpably contradict one another, and no "oligarchy " has yet informed us which one it prefers. Of one thing some of us are sure, we do not wish, or intend, to be bound in the dark, or to be controlled by abstract terms that would make us shrink from keeping our obligations in a concrete way; and we know that nothing is more illusive than the requirements of a treaty, unless it is very precise and treats of matters clearly and definitely known. We, as a people, went into this war to prevent Germany from throttling the world, as she had done to Belgium, and Serbia, and whoever else opposed or did not aid her. It was not to secure for her a place of equality in a society whose laws and whose material interests she had deliberately planned to destroy, that two million peaceful American citizens put on their uniforms and went to Europe over seas in whose waters torpedoes lurked and mines floated. It was to render this savagery forever impossible.

We have not, however, to read far before we discover that it is not a league in the sense of a mere legal compact, with minutely specified obligations, that Mr. Austin Harrison has in mind. " The real problem in a League of Nations is, to my mind ", he says, " not the sanction—that the soldiers will see to on their return—not the machinery, not the tribunal, not the immediate dispensation of justice, but the creation of a regularized co-operation capable of the necessary flexibility and progressiveness, which alone can give it the life of durability." In brief, it is not a treaty signed by diplomatists, but a union of consciences in a common cause of justice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is to save the world. Of this no American soldier, I think, would need to be convinced. It was a consciousness of this in his own understanding that made him accept gladly his marching orders.

In another article in the same Review, Austin Harrison, to illustrate his meaning, cites the words of the President of the United States uttered on September 27th, 1918: "It is the peculiarity of this great war that, while statesmen have seemed to cast about for definitions of their purpose and have sometimes seemed to shift their ground and point of view, the thought of the mass of men, whom statesmen are supposed to instruct and lead, has grown more and more unclouded, more and more certain of what it is they are fighting for. National purposes have fallen more and more into the background, and the common purpose of enlightened mankind has taken their place. The counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are playing a game of power and playing for high stakes. That is why I have said that this is a people's war, not a statesman's. Statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken."

These are words as true as they are nobly spoken. They have given to the man who uttered them an unprecedented prestige. In words equally true and noble, Mr. Harrison expresses the expectations which they inspire. "In place of diplomacy acting in secrecy for purely selfish or national motives, Europe is bidden to regard the opportunity of the whole, bidden to the law of a commonwealth." This is assumed to be the message of America that is to save Europe.

Unfortunately, this message is enveloped in a nebula shot through with seeming contradictions. "It is not", Mr. Harrison continues, "a question of juridical form and formula. Its sanction must be inborn, induced—the evolution of harmony. Peace can never be established on a durable basis through the organization of international councils of control; by police machinery; still less by penal or constrictive impositions. That is the old—the Napoleonic, the German—way. . . . All must go to the table of peace ready to give and to give up; to found a charter of international rights based not on force, but on the sanction of free peoples."

This might well be the message of America. It sounds well, and may be true; though perhaps rather puzzling to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of the League to Enforce Peace. But what is the authority for it? Who has been charged to deliver America's message? Who has formulated it? Who has explained it?

In glowing words, Mr. Harrison reiterates the thought that Europe is to be somehow saved by America. "Either an attempt to restart Europe on some accepted law or morality of co-operative utility instead of competitive force with the object of removing the causes of war, or we shall achieve nothing permanent", he declares. And it is America that is to give the start. And he tells us in what manner. "I can only repeat," he says, "what I have urged again and again, that national conferences should be convened, charged to offer their concerted advice upon the problems of the subject peoples; that these conferences should consider concurrently a common agenda; that the proceedings of all these conferences should be made public, and that they should be in daily telegraphic communication with one another. Something of the kind has been done in France, but here (in England) we have heard of no such assembly of intellect. A Declaration of Rights can hardly issue from a bureaucracy; it must come from the clash of the best minds of democracy, thinking aloud. . . . For the problems are not only international, they are also national, and the danger to the constitution of the new fabric of laws will be found in their application. That is why the collective wisdom emanating from these National Conferences would seem the indispensable condition of the success of any permanent international law. . . . Now the antecedent condition to such a Law of Nations must be a Declaration of Rights."

What progress have we, the American people, made in this direction? We are assumed to have felt,—we are said even to have imparted to Europe,—the impulse toward a better international adjustment; but what channel for its expression, what mechanism for its effective operation, has been deliberately even discussed either by or before the people? "The voice of the people must make itself felt, directing the voice of the Conference", we are told; "for only so can there be any 'demonstration' of the new thought essential to release, or any manifestation of sacrifice." What an opportunity then has been missed, to say openly what sacrifices are expected of us? What obligations are to be incurred by us? What legal forms are to be accepted by us, in the great process of creating an international government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, in important matters, will supersede our own? for that is what is implied in a " League of Nations ".

I shall not attempt to enter here upon any analysis of the various ingenious drafts of an international constitution, as the fundamental law regulating the legislative, judicial, and executive powers of such an international government,—a government which, within its sphere, will control the governments of the nations that subscribe to it. One thing, however, is plain, that to possess any efficiency these powers must detract in important ways and in large degree from the powers of the National Governments and involve a considerable sacrifice of their sovereignty. It is true, on the one hand, that sovereignty in what are called the " democracies " has been gradually transferred from a personal absolute monarch to the people, or to some portion of them; and it is also true, on the other hand, that the conception of sovereignty in constitutional States has been to some degree modified by the recognized limitation of the irresponsible use of force and the addition of ethical elements in its exercise. In brief, no people can rightly claim to possess rights in proportion to their power, and sovereignty cannot, in a juristic sense, be longer regarded as strictly absolute. In every state founded upon the rights of persons, which is the basis claimed by democracy, the rights of the whole people cannot exceed what is necessary to the maintenance of the right of each.

In proportion as they become republican, as Kant contends, States may find it easier to combine in federations than was the case with absolute monarchies; still, even republics are jealous of their sovereign powers, and they are not disposed lightly to surrender them. Every scheme for a League of Nations requires this surrender in some degree, for every such league creates in some form a supernational body of control, to which the members agree to submit. Membership in such a league, of necessity, implies the renunciation of any independent foreign policy.

In a world composed of nations varying in culture, character, education, and honor, as well as in numbers, strength, and military traditions, such a renunciation cannot wisely be made without unusual assurances, and it cannot be universal. If made at all, it must be made for the sake of advantages not otherwise attainable, and for an association that is beyond suspicion. A league which had for its object to enforce peace, without specific foreknowledge of the occasions that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might call for its exercise of the war-making power, could not be wisely created except between nations of the highest moral responsibility and mutual confidence, and could never safely be allowed to include any nation that could not be trusted to accept and obey the decisions of a tribunal to which it might consent to submit a difference.

A league professing to be composed only of "free nations" would rest upon a basis of an extremely ambiguous character. What nations are to be classed as "free"? Certainly no nation that holds in subjection any people not permitted to enjoy self-government. And the mutability of nations must not be overlooked. The expression "free nations" is especially equivocal in a period of revolution and transition, like the present. Neither Russia, nor Austria-Hungary, nor even Germany could claim a place in it, nor could the fragments into which they may possibly fall before the movements of revolt or secession are completed. And what is to be said of the suppressed nationalities which are aspiring to independence but have not yet attained it?

Is it not a little singular that the course of events and the effort to control them by general principles should have led men to claim that the coming peace should include such logical antinomies as a partial renunciation of national sovereignty and the complete attainment of self-determination?

The origin of the problem is more evident than its solution. On the one hand, some nations are regarded as too independent, too powerful, and too aspiring, to be considered safe for the rest of the world, unless they are willing to have imposed upon them certain restraints which equality seems to require; while, on the other, some nations are too much oppressed, too feeble, and too submissive, to assert the national rights which even-handed justice would assign to them.

We are here confronted with the indisputable fact of the natural inequality of nations, and this disparity extends to every circumstance of national life, except one. Juristically, all independent and responsible States, whether large or small, have equal abstract rights to existence, self-preservation, self-defense, and self-determination; but culturally, economically, and potentially, they are, and must remain, unequal. If they enter a "League of Nations", they must enter it upon terms which the strong are disposed to grant to the weak and which the weak are obliged to accept from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strong. It is evident who will make the laws. But if self-determination is a right, and its realization is possible only through the exercise of force, who shall say that a suppressed nation may not plan and achieve its own development, as the greater States have done? Shall the great empires impose upon the world an unchangeable status of their own devising; or shall the Balkan States, for example, agree upon their own boundaries and affiliations?

The problem of adjustment is further complicated by the fact that the modern nation is no longer a merely juristic entity, having for its only object the maintenance of order and justice among its own inhabitants. It has become an economic entity, a business corporation, looking for markets for its commodities and for raw material from which to manufacture them. The State owns mines, railways, steamships, colonies, and uses them as means of increasing its own power of control over the products and the markets of the world. Will it open its house to the passer-by, invite him to its banquet-board, and share with him its accumulated treasures?

This is a question which time will answer. And a very short time has sufficed for a partial response. Every one of the Powers is now planning how it may increase its trade, and how it may extend its control over natural resources.

In so far as the object of a "League of Nations" is to prevent this rivalry from becoming dangerously acute, its purpose is no doubt commendable; but the danger it involves is, that, in striving to enforce a legal compulsion, it may be felt to be oppressive,—a new type of multiplex imperialism in place of the old. In one respect, at least, this danger is imminent. If a "League of Nations" proves to be a device to compel independent nations to make economic sacrifices for the benefit of others, and establishes a central control of resources which becomes a dispenser of benefits which the beneficiaries have not aided in creating, then the League will prove a bondage that will be resented, and will not be endured. It is very appealing to our better natures to inform us, that the future is to be "a life of service", in which we must perform a generous part. If this is voluntary, the call may well be a spur to action. But if the "League of Nations" aims to obtain these sacrifices, not by such voluntary action as the associated nations have freely offered to one another during the period of war, by supplies of food, loans of money, free medical service, and gifts of a magnitude which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world has never before known, but by the enforced operation of a legal contract, the call is different. In one scheme at least, the world's supplies, the world's credit, and the world's military strength, in the name of equal economic opportunity together with the " freedom of the seas," whatever that may mean, are to be placed under the control of a central authority,—an International Ministry or Council of Delegates, whose decisions shall be paramount and final in the great questions of trade and war.

England cannot surrender her defense of the sea, nor France be forced into economic community with a convicted burglar, nor America obliged to open her ports on conditions imposed by a supernational control predominantly composed of foreign representatives.

If nations had not developed into business corporations, and had confined their activities to the realm of protecting the rights of their individual citizens, a " League of Nations " might have meant something quite different from this. Laws of a universal character might have been readily assented to for the uniform protection of individual persons which it is now difficult for sovereign Powers to accept as applying to themselves. This is particularly true when international restraints are directed against perfect freedom in national fiscal policy. No nation whose citizens are required by their habits and climate to maintain a high standard of living, or suffer deterioration by lowering it, can afford to bind itself to grant equal terms to imports, especially manufactured articles, from all countries alike. They would soon find their working classes reduced to starvation wages accompanied by the total paralysis of many lines of industry as a consequence of an enforced competition with lower races, living in climates and under conditions where the customary standard of life can be maintained at a trifling cost, while foreign employers were reaping rich harvests of profit by exploiting practically subject peoples.

Under such a régime, the people of the United States would suffer more than any others, for the reason that their standard of living is the highest in the world. It is on this account that by voluntary sacrifice the United States has been able to rescue from starvation and to supply with needed commodities the impoverished nations of the world. This has been one of their chief contributions to the Great Understanding, the Entente of Free Nations, in saving from ruin the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries overridden by centralized economic power. It has been possible because personal initiative and enterprise, protected and left free to achieve its own development without absorption by the State, had accumulated forces and agencies which, being free, were in reality the most efficient in the world. Without that freedom and without that protection, the contribution of America in the war would have been impossible. Our country would have been in a state of colonial dependence upon the great manufacturing centers of the European nations.

Our interest and our policy are, therefore, plain: first of all, to hold fast to our freedom; and, next, to prevent from falling into desuetude that unwritten charter of union which constitutes the Entente of Free Nations, cherishing its unity of purpose as the most precious of human achievements. It is a moral, not a legal unity, that has given us the victory. Uncovenanted armies have gathered from every quarter of the globe to assert the determination of the free nations that the rule of arbitrary force shall be ended. Our sons and brothers have been among them. Together they have faced death and have shed their blood, and men of many nations sleep in common graves. It is the most splendid assurance for the peace of the world and the rule of justice that can be imagined. The sense of comradeship in a holy cause cannot perish. A new Brotherhood of Men has come into being. Let us not mar its simplicity by distrust or controversy, or try to force upon any of our co-belligerents any untried theory of legal union which might be honestly rejected, or accepted with doubt and reluctance. The battle has been fought in the name of freedom. Let us remain free in the hour of victory.

But in our freedom there are certain principles which must not and will not be forgotten. They will control the practice of the Entente of Free Nations, which must continue with its present provisions for conference, discussion, and united action. A marked step of advancement has been taken in the recognition of the principle that all international engagements and undertakings must be justified by the moral law and must have publicity. A formal covenant in this sense may be found possible, and it may take a solemn legal form; but, whether this be the case or not, the war has established a few precepts that will, undoubtedly, be admitted to a permanent place in the code of international right. No

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaty between nations should be considered binding unless it is published when it is made. No negotiations affecting the destinies of peoples should be conducted without their knowledge of the fact and of the obligations to which they are to be committed. No war should be begun without a public statement of the reasons for it and an opportunity for public mediation between the disputants, which should never be considered an offense. No territory occupied in war should be claimed by right of conquest without a public hearing of all who are affected by it.

The attempt to state these, or any, definite principles, illustrates how inadequate a strictly documentary form of engagement of necessity must be. It is, however, the spirit, not the form, that must be depended upon for the security which a formal treaty of alliance or an understanding can afford. The whole structure of international peace and justice rests upon the character of the peoples who form the Society of Nations. The Great War has subjected the combatants to a fiery test. It cannot well be doubted that the Entente of Free Nations will stand also the test of peace. A solidarity that has been only strengthened by the dangers of battle will certainly not be broken in the attempt to revise the Law of Nations, to make it the basis of clearer understandings, and to increase the confidence with which the co-partners in victory will bring before the judgment bar of reason the differences that may tend to divide them. But the perfection of this understanding is a matter of growth and of gradual adjustment. What cannot be accomplished by a stroke of the pen at a given moment of time may prove an easy task if the spirit of the Entente, and especially the sense of freedom which brought it into being, can be retained and matured. But this can be done only by a renunciation of the desire to force any favorite plan to an issue within the Entente. For a considerable time, unless new dangers are to be incurred, armies and navies will be necessary to guard the peace that is to be signed at Versailles. It will be wise to maintain the supremacy of the forces that will have made it possible. For this the responsibility rests upon all, according to their strength. And because they are strong they may, by the constancy, justice, and unselfishness of their conduct, prove to all mankind that really free nations alone can preserve the peace of the world.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

BY EDWARD S. CORWIN

Professor of Politics, Princeton University

THE term Freedom of the Seas well illustrates what Professor James meant by "power-giving words,"—it is a phrase to conjure with. When Dr. Dernburg arrived in this country in the autumn of 1914 to instruct us in the German version of the war, he pounced upon this phrase with great avidity. We were told that the war was at bottom a war for the Freedom of the Seas and against "British Navalism," which was as bad as if not worse than militarism. Indeed, if Americans were alive to their interests they must prefer the success of Germany, whose army could never assail the United States, while American overseas commerce must always be subject in war time to British attack. Thereupon, Dr. Dernburg made a proposal: the sea was to be neutralized; navies were not to be abolished precisely, but they were to be retained only for purposes of coast defense, and were not to leave their own territorial waters. If they did, a *casus belli* was the result.

Coming from the representative of the nation whose armies had just overrun Belgium the suggestion sounded somewhat humorous. Nor could the oily doctor's aspersions on British navalism be taken over-seriously by those who recalled Germany's scornful rejection of Mr. Winston Churchill's "Naval Holiday" scheme a few years earlier. The fact is, of course, that since the late nineties Germany has done her utmost to treat the world to a double dose of militarism *and* navalism, while the British Navy has never until the present war had a considerable army back of it. Moreover, many of us felt that if it was really desirable to repeat the experiment of neutralization—at any rate, until the invasion of Belgium was successfully avenged—the air rather than the sea should be the region thus immunized from the terrors of warfare. But that was a subject regarding which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Dernburg had nothing to say. Presumably he was fearful of intruding upon Count Zeppelin's department.

Today Freedom of the Seas is up for discussion under very different auspices. In his " peace without victory " address to the Senate of January 22, 1917, President Wilson said:

> The paths of the sea must alike in law and in fact be free. The Freedom of the Seas is the *sine qua non* of peace, equality, and co-operation. No doubt a somewhat radical reconsideration of many of the rules of international practice . . . . may be necessary in order to make the seas indeed free and common in practically all circumstances for the use of mankind. . . .
>
> The free, constant, unthreatened intercourse of nations is an essential part of the process of peace and development . . . . it is a problem closely connected with the limitation of naval armaments and the co-operation of the navies of the world in keeping the seas at once free and safe.
>
> And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programmes of military preparation.

Here, in other words, we find Freedom of the Seas presented as one item of a general scheme of world peace; and it is the same in the President's Fourteen Points of last January, which we shall have occasion to consider later on in this paper. Even in this connection the phrase has met with sharp challenge from an important quarter. In his note to the German Government of November 5, Secretary Lansing quotes from " A Memorandum of Observations " of the Allied Governments as follows:

> They (the Allied Governments) must point out that . . . . clause 2, relating to what is usually described as the Freedom of the Seas, is open to various interpretations, some of which they could not accept. They must, therefore, reserve to themselves complete freedom on this subject when they enter the Peace Conference.

In what sense Freedom of the Seas is to appear as a part of the new order of things growing out of the war is clearly a question of moment.

Freedom of the Seas in time of peace—which strictly speaking is the only Freedom of the Seas there is—has a fairly definite connotation. It means the denial of the right of any state to assert jurisdiction over the vessels of other states outside its own territorial waters. This meaning of the phrase derives from Grotius's celebrated pamphlet on the Mare Liberum, which appeared in 1609. During the Middle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ages the small portions of the sea which were known and navigated did, in fact, fall for the most part to the jurisdiction of particular states, which were thus charged with the duty of mapping their coast lines, of charting their shoals, and keeping them free of pirates. On the whole, therefore, it was to the advantage of everybody that Freedom of the Seas did not exist,—indeed, the idea had not yet dawned.

Nor did the discovery of America at first shatter the old notions. When, accordingly, in 1493, Pope Alexander VI drew a line through the Atlantic and assigned to Spain the exclusive right to trade, explore, and colonize to the westward of it, and to Portugal a like monopoly to the eastward, his action was hardly challenged. On the contrary, the other two principal maritime states of the day, France and England, set promptly about plotting spheres of influence on the face of the Atlantic for themselves, and as an incident of this enterprise John Cabot began in 1497 that age-long search for a northwest passage to the Indies which was ended only the other day by the Norwegian Amundsen.

The spell of acquiescence was first clearly broken by the Dutch, who demanded the right to voyage to the East Indies in defiance of the Portuguese pretentions, and it was for his countrymen that Grotius spoke. His argument was twofold: First, that as a matter of fact no state could effectively appropriate so vast an area of water as the Ocean—for it was to the High Seas that he confined his argument—and secondly, even if a state could appropriate the Ocean no legitimate good could accrue to it from doing so, the Ocean being susceptible of unlimited use without diminution of value to any user of it. In short, the sea was like the air, a *res communis*, a *res publica*, " designed for the use of all."

Grotius's pamphlet was a vast success. His follower Bynkershoek reiterated his contentions, and fortified them with the today generally accepted doctrine of the Marine League, that littoral states may assert jurisdiction over the sea for one marine league out from shore, provided they accord the peaceful merchant vessels of other states a right of passage through such waters. Later writers have extended Grotius's principle to the great arms of the Sea, the so-called " Narrow Seas," till one by one the exclusive pretentions of states over these too have disappeared. One of the latest episodes of this phase of the struggle for Freedom of the Seas was the abolition by Denmark of the tolls which she had for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merly levied upon vessels passing to and from the Baltic. This was brought about in 1857 largely in consequence of the vigorous attitude of the United States. And meantime, the United States had also taken a hand in uprooting two other venerable institutions which stood in the way of the unhampered use of the seas for the purposes of peaceable trade, namely, the pretended right of the Barbary States to prey upon the vessels of any nation refusing them tribute, and the right of search which was claimed by various European States even in peace times. The Barbary Pirates were forced to yield their pretentions, so far as American vessels were concerned, by Commodore Decatur in 1815. The same year witnessed the end of the war of 1812, which had been fought over the impressment question; and while the Treaty of Ghent was silent on this vital topic, American vessels have never since then been subjected to search except in time of war and for the purpose of enforcing well-recognized belligerent rights.

We may say, therefore, that for those States which have natural access to the sea or one of its principal branches, Freedom of the Seas today exists in very complete measure in time of peace. What, however, of those States which are not so favorably situated? Their disadvantage is of course due in the first instance to geographical accident, but that does not signify that it may not be removed by law and treaty. On this point President Wilson has said:

> So far as practicable . . . . every great people now struggling toward a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea. Where this cannot be done by the cession of territory it can no doubt be done by the neutralization of direct rights of ways under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself. With a right of comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

He apparently had Poland especially in mind, but since the above words were written Czecho-Slovakia has been erected into a State and Hungary has been reconstituted, and both these countries are land-locked. The same, moreover, would be the case with South Germany if it should secede from the former Empire. The Peace Conference will not improbably have its initial tussel with the problem of the Freedom of the Seas in providing for such communities.

We turn now to the much more complex questions raised

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the suggestion that there should be Freedom of the Seas even in war time. Hitherto war and Freedom of the Seas, in the strict sense of the term, have been mutually contradictory ideas. For under the existing rules of international practice, the moment war breaks out in any quarter of the globe, the whole ocean becomes shrouded with belligerent rights. Thus each belligerent has the right to capture the merchant vessels of its enemy and the enemy-owned goods aboard them, and the further right to prevent neutral vessels from carrying contraband of war to its enemy or from entering the duly blockaded ports of such enemy. Also, in order that it may exercise these rights effectively, each belligerent may authorize its public vessels to approach all merchant vessels encountered in non-territorial or belligerent waters and to subject them to visit and search. But if the principle of Freedom of the Seas is to be applied in war time in the same sense in which it is applied in times of peace, all such belligerent rights must be extinguished. This is clear. However, the idea of " Freedom of the Seas " has often been invoked with a less rigorous connotation in mind. It has meant the recasting of the rules of international law with a view either to enlarging the privileges of neutral trade or with a view to adjusting the balance between inferior and superior naval strength. Let us again turn to the history of the question.

Until the Civil War our interest in the question of Freedom of the Seas in war times was that of a neutral trading state; at least, we thought, if we should ever become involved with a European State, it would be with our " hereditary foe," the predominant naval Power of the world. From the time of the American Revolution, accordingly, our Government championed the notion of " Free ships, free goods," the idea that contraband should be limited to munitions of war, and the further idea that blockades as strictly military operations must be confined to places under investment also from the land side. Then in 1785, in a treaty with Prussia, our Government took a farther step. It agreed that if the two contracting parties should become involved in war with each other.

> All merchant and trading vessels employed in exchanging the products of different places and thereby rendering the necessaries, conveniences, and comforts of human life more easy to be obtained and more general, shall be allowed to pass free and unmolested; and neither of the contracting Powers shall grant or issue any commission

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to any private-armed vessels empowering them to take or destroy such trading vessels or interrupt such commerce.

This revolutionary proposal seems to have been the suggestion of Franklin. Frederick assented to it because, as he afterward explained, he had thought the likelihood of war between the two countries so slight that he had felt warranted in indulging his sentiments on this occasion.

Thus was the *American Doctrine* of the Freedom of the Seas first brought to the light of day. It may be well to pause at this point to consider the arguments that have been offered in support of it. The most persuasive is that so long as private property on the high seas is exposed to enemy attack, superior naval power enjoys an unfair advantage even in peace times. But, on the other hand, the weaker naval power may enjoy some equally artificial advantage, as for instance superior military power. Another argument consists in urging the alleged fact that private property on land is exempt from confiscation in time of war, and it is asked, why should not private property on the sea be as well situated. Unfortunately the alleged fact is not a fact. Pillage has been abolished but so has privateering. For the rest, as the present war has shown, private property on land is subject to destruction, devastation, and all sorts of uncompensated burdens, when it occurs within the range of hostile operations or in territory under enemy occupation. Finally, it is urged that it would be humane to exempt private property on the sea from capture. This argument is not very convincing either. As war goes, it is difficult to conceive of a more humane method of bringing pressure to bear upon an enemy. It is only as the part of a general plan of world peace, or at least of disarmament, that the American contention has much force.

Nevertheless, the view which our Government thus developed for the first time in a treaty with the House of Hohenzollern has since remained, with a single though significant interruption, its characteristic interpretation of Freedom of the Seas. By the Declaration of Paris in 1856 the principle of " Free ships, free goods " was written into international law. Indeed, the immunity thus conferred on enemy goods aboard neutral vessels was also extended to neutral goods aboard enemy vessels. On the other hand, enemy vessels and enemy goods aboard the same still remained subject to belligerent capture, while as a concession to Great Britain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

privateering was pronounced abolished, with a tremendous resultant consolidation of naval force in the hands of that Power. Our Government accordingly declined to assent to the Declaration. The United States, it urged, was a weak naval power with a large overseas commerce carried on in great part in American bottoms. Until, therefore, the American principle of withdrawing all innocent private property on the high seas from the operations of warfare should be adopted, our Government must retain the right to assail an enemy's commerce through recourse to privateering.

Five years later the Civil War broke out, and the attitude of the United States on the whole question of Freedom of the Seas in war time was reversed almost over night. Not only was American commerce swept off the seas in the course of the war, but throughout its progress our national interest was that of the stronger naval belligerent. Instantly our naval commanders, and following in their wake our Prize Courts, took over the entire baggage of British doctrine with reference to the rights of a naval belligerent, and what is more, added several Yankee improvements. Contraband was extended to "articles of double use." In the case of absolute contraband, like munitions of war, the doctrine of Ultimate Destination was devised to trap goods intended for transshipment from neutral Mexican ports into the interior of the Confederacy. But the great contribution of this phase of the war was the commercial or "starvation blockade," in enforcing which, we adopted the British practise of subjecting vessels suspected of intending a breach of the blockade to capture the moment they left their home waters. Then in the case of the *Springbok* the Supreme Court upheld the condemnation of goods consigned to a British West Indian port whence it had been intended to transship them in another vessel to blockaded ports of the South. This was the American version of the doctrine of Continuous Voyage.

But the Civil War being over, American policy promptly returned to its earlier groove. Partly this was due to the inertia of tradition, but partly also it represented a new situation. We still held aloof from European affairs, and deduced from that fact the conclusion that any considerable naval war would probably find us neutral. At the same time, with a rapidly expanding foreign commerce, we found ourselves largely dependent upon a foreign merchant marine which the first breath of European war might sweep from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the seas, leaving us commercially stranded. When, therefore, our Government undertook to formulate the instructions of our delegates to the first Hague Conference in 1899 it felt the time ripe for urging the American Doctrine upon the world once more. At this Conference, at the succeeding conference of 1907 and again at the London Naval Conference some months later, the American delegates urged that private property on the high seas, unless contraband of war or intended for a blockaded port, should be exempt from belligerent capture. Nor did the American delegates stand alone in this matter. Opposed by the representatives of the Entente and of Japan, they found their stand supported by the delegates of the Triple Alliance.

It must be pointed out, however, that even at this moment Germany's attitude and interest, while coinciding to the extent just indicated with our own, were at base opposed thereto. Our attitude was still, as just stated, that of a nation planning neutrality; that of Germany was the attitude of a nation plotting war against superior naval power. The further propositions of Germany on these various occasions make this quite clear. Thus she insisted upon the right to lay mines in the open sea, though under restrictions meant to curtail as much as practicable their possibilities for mischief to neutrals. Again she insisted upon the right to convert peaceable merchantmen at sea into war vessels,—a new species of privateering. Lastly, she demanded the right, which she was later to exercise in the case of the *Frye,* to destroy neutral vessels carrying contraband without having to bring them into port for purposes of adjudication. In short, Germany's effort throughout was directed not toward making neutral commerce more secure, but toward cutting down the advantage which Great Britain derived under the existing rules of law from her superior fleet and her numerous coaling stations scattered over the globe. And obviously Germany's conduct of naval operation in the present war has simply proceeded along the line of this endeavor, though as it chanced, she found in the submarine a weapon singularly adapted to her purpose. So Freedom of the Seas became at her handling anarchy of the seas, its motto "*spurlos versenkt.*"

And what meantime has been the history of England's attitude toward the problem of Freedom of the Seas? Till the outbreak of the present war it has been for a century past a history of steady, and for the most part uncoerced,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concession. In the course of this period England has abandoned non-belligerent visit and search; she has sacrificed the old doctrine of indelible allegiance—"Once an Englishman, always an Englishman"—which had supported her earlier policy of impressment; she has accepted the principle of "Free ships, free goods." Also, speaking broadly, the British Fleet has been during this time one of the great forces making for liberalism, as the liberation of Greece and of Italy and the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine eloquently testify. Finally it was England who in 1908 issued the invitations for the London Naval Conference, the work of which, the Declaration of London, recorded still further notable concessions on the part of sea power.

But this time the policy of concession over-reached itself; the House of Lords refused to assent to the legislation necessary to put the Declaration of London into operation. When, moreover, at the outbreak of the European War President Wilson proposed to the belligerent parties that, notwithstanding that the Declaration had not yet been generally ratified, they should treat it as a part of the law of nations, while Germany assented outright, Great Britain accompanied her assent with material conditions, and the proposal fell through. A few months later the British Government proclaimed its embargo upon all trade with Germany, a proceeding which made a "scrap of paper" of the Declaration of Paris and overrode even more ancient restrictions upon naval warfare. The central feature of the British "blockade," so-called, was its stoppage of all goods, innocent and contraband alike, passing to or from Germany through neutral ports. The extraordinary character of the measure was somewhat concealed by the fact that comparatively few neutral ports were affected by it, but had the war been confined to Great Britain and Germany and had the former then sought to stop all goods destined to Germany through neutral ports, the remarkable character of the attempt would have been evident at once.

Why, then, it will be asked, did we finally enter the war on England's side? In the first place, we had a decided preference for England's type of law breaking, which though it touched our pockets, did not wring our hearts as did Germany's. But more than that, as Germany's designs became plainer, we discovered that for the time being at any rate the question of Freedom of the Seas had become subordinate to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the question of the freedom of the earth, and not being amphibians we naturally felt more concerned on the latter score. Nor had we meantime necessarily any thought of abandoning permanently our views of a free sea, as President Wilson's Fourteen Points of January 8 indicated. Accordingly, now that the battle for free institutions has been won—so far as it can be won on the battle field,—now that military power has been broken and the prospect for a general disarmament on land is good, our Government again presses for the limitation of naval power.

In this connection let us consider some aspects of the Fourteen Points. Nine of these deal more or less specifically with certain details of the immediate peace settlement, and may be dismissed without further mention. The five of broader import read as follows:

> I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at; after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.
>
> II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.
>
> III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.
>
> IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety. . . .
>
> XIV. A general association of nations must be formed, under specific covenants, for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike.

So far as this language bears upon the problem of the Freedom of the Seas, its meaning seems fairly clear. There is to be a League of Nations vested with a certain control over the highways of commerce, which it may exert in support of international covenants. But notwithstanding the League of Nations, there will remain the peril of war, and when war comes freedom of navigation on the high seas is to be absolute except so far as it is restricted by action of the League. Individual belligerents, therefore, will have no right to assail their enemy's commerce in any way. So far as they are concerned the right of blockade will be abolished, the carriage of contraband will go unmolested, private prop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erty on the high seas will be exempt from capture. In short, the American doctrine of Freedom of the Seas will be realized and surpassed. Moreover, individual naval forces will be " reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety." Of course the crucial question is, Will Great Britain subscribe to such a programme?

We have already had something of an index to the British point of view regarding this question in the caveat of the allied Governments which was quoted earlier in this article. It is also an ominous fact that since that caveat was filed, while numerous British statesmen have been crying up the League of Nations idea, not one has uttered a word favorable to Freedom of the Seas, and few have said anything about it. This silence, however, has not been maintained by British pamphleteers, with the result that we need remain in no ignorance regarding the British position. In a word, it is that sea power is the backbone of the British Empire and essential to its defense; and it is asked with some asperity whether England should be expected to surrender her historic protection in reliance upon a plan of world organization which has not yet been even launched? The query is further pointed by reference to the great part which the British Fleet has played in the defeat of Germany.

Any fair man must feel considerable sympathy with this position. At the same time, it must be remembered that the most frequently offered apology for British so-called " navalism " throughout the past four years has been that it was necessary as a defense against German militarism, an apology which at the moment has lost much of its cogency. Some measure of concession from her triumphant sea power is bound therefore to be demanded of England by the rest of the world, if only in proof of her sincerity respecting the project of world organization. Also, there are at least two more material considerations counseling such concession even from the point of view of England's own security.

The first of these may be stated in words borrowed from an English statesman, the late Lord Courtney of Penwith:

> An open-eyed recognition of the relative development of ourselves and the United States . . . should at once set aside the dream, if it were ever entertained, of a naval predominance on our part to endure from generation to generation . . . . Having regard to population, accumulated resources and physical power, the notion of challenging the United States to a running competition in ships of war is seen to be idle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One hundred and forty years ago the Count De Vergennes, Louis XVI's foreign minister and the author of the French-American Alliance in the War of Independence, predicted that the time would come when America would be an "overmatch for the whole naval power of Europe." It is perhaps the purpose of Secretary Daniels' recently announced programme of construction to convey a hint that the hour foreseen by the French secretary is at hand.

The second consideration is, however, at the moment perhaps even more persuasive. It is epitomized in the word "submarine." There was a moment in the present war when the submarine stirred some very unpleasant feelings in the hearts of British officials; there was never a moment from the autumn of 1916 to within a few weeks of the end of the war when it ceased to be formidable. Of all the great Powers Great Britain is by far the weakest in the matter of provision, the most dependent upon the uninterrupted flow of supplies from the outside world. As Mr. Balfour expressed it, in opposing certain of the features of the Declaration of London: "Starvation not invasion is the danger of this country," and the suggestion has certainly not lost point since then. Nor is this to imply that the submarine will ever again be used with the outrageous disregard of humane considerations with which Germany used it. But it is a comparatively new weapon, and its possibilities for legitimate warfare may yet undergo great development.

Prophecy is proverbially a hazardous business. Nevertheless, in light of the facts just mentioned and of the further fact that for some years Great Britain has been endeavoring to ease the burden imposed by competition in naval armaments, it ought not be surprising if her delegates at the Peace Conference should be willing to accept a compromise arrangement which would represent on the whole a very considerable concession to the principle of Freedom of the Seas; for instance, a compromise along the following lines: First, a great limitation of building programmes. Secondly, a general curtailment of existing armaments on a scale sufficient to leave the British Empire secure,—a matter of which Great Britain herself would have to be the judge. Thirdly, a radical remodelling of the rules of practice with reference to contraband, involving the outright abolition of the right of destruction and the substitution (worked out by Great Britain in the present war) of preëmption for confiscation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fourthly, the abolition of the belligerent right of blockade. Fifthly, the retention of the belligerent right of capture of enemy's commerce as defined by the Declaration of Paris.

The advantages of such an arrangement are fairly apparent. Great Britain would lose her right of blockade, it is true, but as has been already indicated she could probably never again hope to distend this right as she has done in the present war. On the other hand, because she is an island, she must always remain most vulnerable to the exercise of blockade by an enemy. Again, the appeal which the suggested compromise would make to neutral interests would guarantee its observance in any ordinary war, in which a limited number of belligerents would be bidding for neutral favor. For while the superior naval Power could speedily expel its enemy's shipping from the sea, the gap would be soon filled by neutral shipping; and by the same sign the control which superior naval strength exerts today even in peace time over a rival's commerce would be appreciably diminished. There is one point at which the arrangement just outlined might be improved from the point of view both of the British and the neutral interest, and that would be by adopting the British suggestion at the Second Hague Conference to throw overboard the whole doctrine of contraband. This, however, is a suggestion to which our own Government would be most likely to file a *non possumus* not to give the thing too fine a point, we have always to remember that to the southward we have a dangerous and treacherous neighbor. Should we become involved in war with Mexico, we should hardly relish the prospect of having to stand by and see other countries stock our enemy with munitions.

One point, however, remains, and it is an exceedingly delicate one. The wording of the second of President Wilson's Fourteen Points, particularly when read in the light of his earlier Address to the Senate, seems to indicate an expectation that the control of such waterways as the Straits of Gibraltar, the Dardanelles, the Bosporus, the Suez Canal, and the Panama Canal should be handed over to the League of Nations, with power to close them against a recalcitrant State. Would Great Britain agree thus to internationalize the route to India? We may answer the question with rather a confident negative. It is true that by the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 the Suez Canal is " always—free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commerce or of war, without distinction of flag," but as Mr. Curzon admitted in the House of Commons in 1898, this convention has never "been brought into practical operation", and throughout the present war the Canal has constituted a British base of operations unrestrictedly. Nor do we have to rely upon inference in this matter. Mr. Winston Churchill has just informed us that "the League of Nations is no substitute for the supremacy of the British fleet". What clearer intimation could we demand that England does not propose to hand over the sources of her control of the seas to an international commission, at any rate in the near future?

The final question raised by President Wilson's proposals with reference to the Freedom of the Seas comes down apparently to this: What kind of a League of Nations are we to have? President Wilson has evidently pictured to himself an association of equal states—"a community of power" to use his own phrase—which should begin to function immediately peace is made, on the basis of the utmost good will and confidence. The British view is quite different. They proceed upon the assumption that for some years to come at least international affairs, if they are to have a unified guidance, will be subject to the direction of those nations which have just brought their common cause to a successful issue. From this point of view it follows that the voluntary coöperation of these nations is a matter, certainly at present, of far greater importance for peace and good order in the world, than new and untested constructions can possibly be. Clearly they are right. But it may still be hoped that the policy of the Allies will steadily tend toward the production of a state of affairs not unlike that dreamt of by the President.

But it must be many years before the suggestion of a real internationalization of the seas can seem other than chimerical. Meantime, however, there can be a measure of disarmament at sea,—provided, of course, there is also an equivalent disarmament on land; and further a recasting of the rules of naval warfare. And these three points sum up what is today demanded in the name of Freedom of the Seas.

Edward S. Corwin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF VICTORY

BY ROLAND G. USHER

THE moment victory became a fact, the fact of victory ceased to be in itself either significant or interesting. Indeed, once the outburst of thanksgiving and elation had spent itself, victory as such sank into the background and the public mind turned instinctively to the astoundingly difficult and dangerous problems of peace and reconstruction. On both, victory could not fail to have a direct influence. The immediate results of the war, so far as both were concerned, took their character from the moment at which victory came and the precise nature of the situation from which it proceeded. For the future student, the eventuality itself, once assured, possessed literally no significance compared to the fact that it came at a definite moment and in precisely such and such a way.

For the United States, indeed, the moment was the all important fact, for it defined the character of victory. That established its immediate significance, which in turn determined our international position for the present and perhaps for a generation, if not for a century. That the war was won was the great fact of significance to us who are now alive; that it was won this year and not next or five years hence; that it was won on French and not on German soil; that it was won without a victorious march across Germany to Berlin; these will be the facts of vital importance to our children and grandchildren.

The significance of victory was determined in the first place by the reasons for German collapse, by the facts it revealed about the attitude of the German people toward their own Government, and about the internal condition of Germany. It had been clear from the first that seventy millions of people could not by any sort of military victory be literally annihilated or crushed, could not by any army of occupation be coerced and policed, if they remained strong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and unrepentant. The attitude of the German people toward their own Government, toward the war, toward victory or defeat, toward the future, had been hidden by clouds of propaganda and deceit which only the end of the war could dispel. From a military victory, the result of the superior numbers of Germany's enemies, one sort of a peace and one kind of a settlement became inevitable. Drastic territorial guarantees would be essential to assure even a moderate measure of relative security for France and Belgium and the continuation of armament, fleets and debts for the future. Such a victory signified a foe beaten but strong, crushed but united, defiant, arrogant, unrepentant because still able to resist. It meant victory with qualifications, victory with conditions, safety without security, and peace impermanent and unstable. But if the victory should be due not merely to a military defeat but to a military collapse, itself produced by an economic collapse, by a political revolution, or by the loss of morale in army or people or both, it would have an utterly different significance for the future and provide for both peace and reconstruction premises of the utmost consequence.

Victory was in truth the result of a defeat in the field simultaneous with economic exhaustion, loss of morale, and the first throes of political revolution. It was victory with the foe surrendering in regiments and battalions; with the Reichstag clamoring for the Kaiser's abdication; victory with a republic proclaimed in Munich, with the fleet mutinous, with the "glorious allies" ingloriously deserting, with the Kaiser and Crown Prince in flight. There were those—indeed there are still those—who vividly regretted that Marshal Foch should not have dictated the terms of armistice on German soil, that the Allied army should have had no chance to give the Germans a little taste of their own medicine. But the significance of victory is greater, the outlook for the future brighter because the end of the war did not witness a defeated people doggedly selling their lives on the banks of the Rhine in a vain effort to save the Fatherland. Unconditional surrender in Berlin would have been vastly different from unconditional surrender with the Allies still a measurable distance from the German frontier and far from the final line of German defense, the Rhine. It stood for a lack of national cohesion, for a lack of national faith in their own cause, in their own strength and resources. It stood for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national unwillingness to die for the cause which is all but the most significant fact possible for the future. It proved the aggression of the war: when the moment for self-defense came, they threw up their hands and cried, "Kamerad." If the war had been begun in literal self-defense, there would have been at its end no weakening but rather a stiffening of morale as the enemy approached the frontier. The Government and not the people cried, "Kamerad." The officers, snugly ensconsed in luxurious parlors around mahogany tables, and not ragged men in trenches nor starving peasants in the fields, cried "Kamerad." There they convicted themselves of the true meaning of the war and gave real significance to victory. Yellow will out: the stain of aggression is uneffaceable.

They did more, they gave us the first unmistakable clue to the real attitude toward the war of the masses in Germany, the first irrefutable evidence that the German people have been more sinned against than sinning. The leaders knew the hearts of the nation were not in the war; that the nation had not willed it; that its confidence had never been theirs in the highest sense. They counseled no desperate defense; they made no attempt to rally back to back; they proclaimed no resistance till death as preferable to slavery for free men. They did not deem the German people capable of any such magnificent response as the French made in 1870, with their army crushed, the emperor imprisoned, the state itself overthrown, and Paris surrounded. Was there then talk of surrender with or without conditions? Armies arose from the soil over night like the crop from the sowing of the dragon's teeth. A government was extemporized; generals appeared as if by magic; national leaders were found and followed. Bismarck grew day by day to wonder whether victory was possible even after the war had been won.

Nor did the German leaders believe possible any such stubborn resistance as the Belgian nation had displayed, silent, contemptuous, unconquerable, even though crushed beneath the heel of a foreign army and incapable of the least physical resistance with a breath of hope for success. But who in Belgium spoke of capitulation, who talked of defeat, who gave up hope? Even Serbia, crushed by overwhelming odds, decimated by disease, its territory occupied by the invader, fought on. And Italy! Trembling on the verge of collapse, its armies in rout from the most dire catas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trophe suffered by Allied arms, Italy rose as one man and held the invaders in a military position which their own military authorities believed could not be maintained. But the Germans were different and they knew it. Their leaders were different and they knew it. Their cause was different and the leaders knew that their own people knew it. So they surrendered! There is the crowning significance of victory: the confession of the German leaders that the nation was not and never had been behind them; that it had not and never did have heart for their magnificent schemes of world dominion; that the Germany of Luther, of Beethoven, of Goethe, was not dead but drugged into insensibility. There is another Germany than that of 1914, and they knew themselves incapable of winning its confidence.

II

The significance of victory was determined by the price paid for it. Here lay its importance for the issue of reconstruction: it did not cost the Allies more in men and in resources than they could afford to pay. Their limit was dangerously near. France, Canada, and England in particular lost full as many men, dead and crippled, as they could spare without sacrificing the physical strength of the nation needed to maintain its economic prosperity in the future. But the limit was not reached, certainly not passed, and more was not paid than so sweeping a victory was worth. Victory came in time. There is another significant fact. From the first it was clear that its eventual meaning would lie in the relative price paid by Germany and by the Allies. If the condition of Germany after defeat was not worse than that of the Allies after victory, the war would have been fought in vain; the price would have been too high. But the condition of Germany is beyond measure worse than that of any Allied country, worse perhaps than her greatest enemies have wished for her. The loss of men, the wastage of material has been extreme. Financially the war could not have been handled worse: Germany is bankrupt.

There was, too, a serious danger that the expulsion of the Germans from France and Belgium might unavoidably result in laying waste the entire country and destroy throughout that broad and rich area the permanent gains of civilization for a thousand years, as it had in the districts over which the conflict had previously raged. Victory won at such cost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would clearly have complicated beyond measure the economic and physical recovery of France and would have imposed heavier burdens upon the material resources of the Allies. The war was won before the submarine was able to destroy Allied shipping beyond the point which could be promptly replaced. There were many days when it seemed hardly possible that the success which the Germans promised their people from unrestrained submarine warfare should not reward their perfidy. The war was won before the resources of raw materials and of live stock had been depleted beyond the possibility of immediate repair. True, for two years the Allied countries have been in sorer straits by far than has been revealed. France and Italy in particular have known a destitution greater than perhaps for a century, and even England, its soil untouched by war, knew a degree of privation which intelligent observers had supposed, previous to 1914, would never be possible again.

The difficulty, however, was superficial rather than fundamental, the result of an insufficient number of ships to tap the great supplies in Australia and South America. The submarine did successfully circumscribe the economic area on which the Allies could rely, compelled them to fight the war on the basis of what existed or could be produced in Europe and in North America. In both, the reserve supplies of food and raw materials of all sorts were soon entirely exhausted, and only the intelligent increase of production prevented calamity. But the world's reserve supplies of wool, wheat, hides, nitrates, and metals are not depleted. South America, Australia, and the Orient have accumulated vast amounts which will be available as soon as the necessary shipping can be diverted, and will promptly, with a continuation of the increased production in Europe and North America consequent upon the cessation of hostilities, make good the deficiencies of the Allied nations and still enable us to succor with caution Eastern Europe. Another year of war would have meant extreme suffering in Europe, privation here, and the exploitation of the economic resources of England and the United States beyond the point of safety for the future.

III

Victory emphasized the glorious unselfishness of the part which America has played in the war and will, unless we ourselves destroy it, make permanent the European impression

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our disinterested conduct. There could be for the future relations of the United States with the rest of the world no more unassailable cornerstone than this. There were from the first those who maintained that from the selfish point of view, the United States had everything to gain from the maintenance of an imperceptibly delicate balance of power in Europe. So long as Great Britain, France, and Italy had Germany to fear, so long might the United States hope to hold the balance herself, with all of those attendant material gains in non-European sections of the globe which the old diplomacy had taught would follow from that sort of position. *Per contra,* from the clear preponderance in Europe of any coalition, the United States had everything to lose. Obviously, it was much to our interest to prevent the victory of Germany. That would have been indeed fatal. But, argued from the old diplomatic point of view, there was much to be said for the contention that it was equally our interest to prevent a sweeping victory for the Allies, certainly to prevent too sweeping a victory. For, once Germany was really crushed, the balance of power in Europe would incline toward the Allies and the United States would lose the advantageous position due to the necessity of calling upon her physical strength to redress the balance disturbed by the physical preponderance of the Central Empires.

Not a few of the old school diplomats in Europe and America thus interpreted President Wilson's ideas of a league of nations and his talk of peace without victory. They put their tongues in their cheeks at the mention of the idealistic aims of such diplomacy. It was two for ourselves and one for Germany and the league of nations. Once Germany was beaten, they said, the league would be needless to fetter her, but exceedingly useful to enable the United States to interfere in European policies and to control the Allies themselves. Only by the creation of such a league, indeed, pointed out the diplomats, could the United States by any possibility expect to exert an influence upon European issues. Our concern for the restraint of Germany, for internationalism, for idealism, was thus a neat and effective camouflage for the advancement of our own self-interest. We proposed to prevent the Allies from beating Germany too badly. We proposed if possible, once the victory was won, to prevent the Allies from utilizing it except by our consent and permission.

But the old school diplomats were confounded by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consent of the United States to a sweeping victory, by the heartiness with which we threw into the breach an extended effort, which not only was certain eventually to achieve a sweeping victory, but which could have had no other purpose. The United States entered the war for reasons the most nearly disinterested and impersonal which any great nation ever possessed for an act of such magnitude. We have ended the war upon a similarly high plane. Judged by any standards except those of idealism and disinterestedness, we have contributed to a sort of victory which can only result in detriment to our own position. We have won the war and hurt ourselves. We have lost what some supposed we fought for —the physical possibility of interference in European politics. Yet unquestionably the moral gain must outweigh a thousand-fold any conceivable influence the United States could have exerted as the result of its physical size. Separated as we are from Europe by three thousand miles of ocean, we should never be able to exert physical influence upon European affairs which could not be justly interpreted as aggressive and offensive. Our true influence must be moral, and the true greatness of the United States in the future will come from the fact that our situation enables us to espouse the idealistic even at the cost of our material interest.

We have thus once and for all laid low the suspicions industriously sowed by the Germans, that America would join the war in order to become herself ruler of the world, that the Allies would lose the war thrice over should they depend upon American assistance. The aegis of empire would rest then in the hands of a nation whose physical size and physical position made her unassailable from Europe. The moral splendor of the position of the United States at the moment of victory is for the American people the fact of greatest significance.

IV

It is therefore imperative that we, as a people, should remember the clearest, most obvious, most salient, most fundamental fact about the victory: the United States did not win it. It was won by the French, the British, and the Italians with American assistance. By this cardinal fact international relationships will be conditioned when the new settlement is made. Herein lies the significance of the moment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of victory. Had the war lasted another year the American army would have itself formed the major part of the victorious army. These are well known facts, but just at this moment they cannot be too often emphasized.

The danger is still great, and grows perhaps greater as time elapses, that a natural and pardonable pride in the prowess of our men will unintentionally exaggerate the part we played in the war and thus injure the reputation for magnanimity and unselfish action which the American nation today enjoys abroad to an extent equaled by no nation in history. What we did was so great and so significant that it is easily overstated, but *noblesse oblige* forbids. The French, British, and Italians ransomed their own soil, not we. We lent economic support without which surely the war could not have been continued. We brought at the darkest moment an indispensable moral support without which it is possible the gallant French and the stubborn British might have faltered. But these were indirect factors in victory; and so of our army. The mere presence of our men in France, even though not ready to enter the battle, made possible the use of the trained French and British armies for the great offensive which ended the war. We became the Allied reserve army, and the presence of so many Yanks in France and the knowledge that more Yanks were coming was a decisive though indirect factor in victory. Our share was great, indispensable, significant, but it was a share only.

V

The fact that victory was won by the Allies and not by the United States possessed promptly definite significance for the negotiations of peace. There were an infinitude of specific and detailed arrangements to be made in Europe proper regarding internal and territorial questions which were not and could not be as vitally significant for the United States as for the European nations. Indirectly we are unquestionably interested in their solution; directly they do not concern us. Our Allies will now expect that same generosity and disinterest on our part in the negotiation of peace which we have displayed in the war. They will expect us, and rightly, to acquiesce in their decisions regarding European arrangements which primarily concern them. If the United States sits mute at the Congress, declines to accede to the decisions which they agree are expedient, they will feel a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just cause of umbrage. Primary decisions of essentially European questions the United States will not be expected to influence. We were not and are not now in a position to dictate the boundaries of Alsace-Lorraine, of Poland, or of the Balkans. Our disinterested record, the splendor of our moral position will lend a peculiar weight to such counsel, advice, or warning as our accredited representatives may address to the European statesmen, but the character of victory is such as to foreclose dictation by the United States at the peace conference on European or internal issues. Nevertheless, on all international questions involving nations outside Europe or issues not directly European, or even European issues which might indirectly concern nations outside Europe, the direct and active participation of the United States is certain, and it may be that we shall hold the casting vote. So much the degree of our participation would seem to assure.

ROLAND G. USHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN AERONAUTICS

BY EARLE REMINGTON

(President of the Aeronautical Society of California)

THE Hughes Aircraft Report is a strictly legal recital of facts, and does not go into the practical question of the programme or make any recommendations for improvements. It is known that more than a billion dollars has been spent for aircraft; but as our Government has not taken the people into its confidence regarding the aircraft programme, the condition of the public mind is extremely uneasy. Americans are fearful that the censorship enforced to protect military secrets and prevent the breaking down of army morale may have been extended to cover up a deplorable condition of affairs.

Government statistics show that appropriations for the year ending July 1, 1918 were nearly one billion dollars, and that approximately one half of this amount was for airplanes and motors. For this we have received something less than ten thousand planes, mostly of the type used for training aviators, and about twenty-five thousand motors.

There has been so much talk of the aircraft scandal that the public is now interested in knowing what salvage can be obtained from the wreck; or, in other words, what we shall have to show when the war is over for the expenditure of a billion and a half of dollars. There is reason to fear that the cancellation of the contracts given to the aircraft manufacturers will demoralize this infant industry, and that the mushroom growth will disappear as quickly as it has appeared.

We are now producing in this country large quantities of training planes which compare favorably with anything in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

use in Europe. We are able to produce copies of English and French types of bombing and photographic planes. The progress that has been made in adapting these planes to American factory methods has been painfully slow, and we are today about where we should have been six months ago.

In aerial warfare the bombing, photographic, and observation planes are protected or convoyed by small fast combat planes. We have been compelled to depend during the entire period of the war upon France and England to supply us with these planes. At this time we are about ready to produce two successful types, namely the S. E. 5, an English plane adapted to the Liberty motor, and the LePere, which is a design that Captain LePere, of the French Army, worked out in this country. This latter plane is probably the best prospect of our entire aircraft programme. It probably would have been ready and on the firing line in the spring offensive; but now that the war is over, the contracts for its manufacture are being cancelled.

We are producing in this country the Curtiss motor, which is satisfactory for training purposes; the Hispano-Suiza motor, used for advanced training and photographic planes; and the Liberty motor, which is suitable for bombing, photographic work, and certain types of combat planes. The Buggati motor, which is a European type, is about ready to be produced in this country.

The layman cannot understand why it should take so long to copy successfully a European type. It must be remembered that European and American methods of manufacture are totally different. In Europe the work is done by hand, employing highly trained mechanics. In America it is performed by specially designed machinery, which can produce in great quantity when once in operation. The difference in materials and in method of operation make an exact copy impossible. The Wright Brothers in 1910 were unable to have their motor copied in Europe so that it would operate successfully. The Hispano-Suiza motor required two years of experimentation before it operated successfully as made in America.

The public probably does not realize the vast amount of money that has been spent by this Government in the production of raw materials for aircraft. We entered the war at a time when the raw materials of our Allies had been practically exhausted. In the shortest possible length of time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we had to supply their needs as well as our own. Over $200,000,000 was spent in building railways, sawmills, re-saw plants, and kiln-drying outfits for the production of spruce and fir lumber for airplane purposes. Approximately $70,000,000 was spent to produce "cellulose-acetate," generally known as "cloth dope." It is applied to the cloth surfaces of the wings, etc., and leaves a deposit of celluloid, which stretches the cloth tightly and also waterproofs it. This material is a decomposed by-product of gun-cotton. For certain airplane motors castor oil was required, and money was expended by the Government to import beans and arrange for plantings with farmers in various sections of the South. This crop is now available.

A great deal of money was spent in acquiring and equipping aviation fields, wherein to train our aviators and mechanics. Of the original $640,000,000 appropriation, approximately $40,000,000 was used in acquiring and equipping flying fields. Practically every large factory operating for the Government has in its vicinity a Government testing field, where the airplanes can be given a rigid flying test before they are shipped abroad. In the neighborhood of Los Angeles the Government now has one of the finest balloon schools in the world. In the South we have one flying field specializing in aerial gunnery; in another they instruct in bombing and in another in aerial observation work. It is true that some of these fields have been located in places where, from a military point of view, they should not be. It is to be hoped that, since the war is over and fewer fields will be required, the Government will elect to abandon those that are not properly situated.

The first step in training aviators after they have passed their physical examination has been to send them to one of twelve universities for a course in theoretical aviation and for military instruction. The course given to our fliers is superior to that afforded by foreign countries, and it is to be hoped that these universities will be subsidized by the Government so that they may maintain a department of aerodynamics, including well-equipped laboratories, wind tunnels, etc., so that there may be developed in this country a large group of technically trained engineers having a thorough knowledge of the basic principles of flight and aerofoil design.

This country was in the war for a period of nineteen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

months. At the outset, well informed military authorities stated that it would be two years before we would achieve our maximum power. Remarkable progress has been made in our air programme, but this country would not have been in a position for another six months to oppose successfully the aerial forces of the Central Powers. We have been forced to depend upon England, France and Italy for the advance training of many of our aviators and for all of our combat planes. The first of our aviators, also the first of our mechanics sent to England, were incorporated into English air squadrons. They fought as an integral part of the English Army. The American Army, even when operating independently, has been largely dependent upon Allied air squadrons for protection.

Airplane production, like the construction of a battleship or of a heavy piece of artillery, takes time, and can be done efficiently only by experts who are afforded every opportunity for keeping up to date in their own special subject. To do this we must have ample appropriations and the proper governmental machinery for the development of our air service. This can best be accomplished by the establishment of a Department of Aeronautics, having a secretary equal in rank to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. The Aerial activities of both the Army and Navy should be consolidated and placed under this department. It would then be necessary for the Department of Aeronautics to co-operate with the Signal Corps on problems of signaling for the perfection of the wireless telegraph, wireless telephone, and other methods of transmitting messages from the air. They should co-operate with the Ordnance Department in provision for the arming of our fighting planes. In addition to trained fliers we must have skilled mechanics, inspectors, aeronautical engineers, production supervisors and intelligence officers, so that we may maintain a well rounded organization, in keeping with the importance of the work.

The gradual development of commercial aviation should immediately be fostered by the Government. This need not be a total financial loss to the Government, but there should undoubtedly be subsidized companies who will establish passenger-carrying aerial routes, also routes between important cities for the carrying of express packages. The Post Office Department has already commenced the carrying of mail, and this should be rapidly expanded, particularly in vicini-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties where transportation by rail or automobile is a matter of several days' time at present, and where the use of the airplane would make it a matter of a few hours.

According to my best advices, military authorities agree that the day of the "fixed gun" is passed—that is to say, a piece of artillery, no matter how well protected by fortifications, is certain of destruction if the enemy has once accurately determined its position. It is probable that our coast defences, which are the fixed type, will be so modified that, by means of special railways running parallel to the coast, the big guns, which at present defend only the immediate vicinity of our harbors, can be made mobile and used for the purpose that their name indicates, namely, coast defence. Our aviators should be trained in coast patrol work. They should become familiar with the vicinities in which they would be likely to operate. They should conduct manœuvres in connection with our artillery and our submarines. Permanent coast patrol stations are required, not only on this Continent and in the Panama Canal Zone, but also in our island possessions. The co-operation in defense work between our airplanes and submarines still remains to be worked out. One of the most advanced problems of coast defence, but one which is capable of solution, is the control of a submarine torpedo from an airplane by the use of wireless appliances.

Through the shortsighted policy of our Government, the officers of our Army and Navy have not been given sufficient opportunity to secure technical training. In individual cases this has been possible, but only in an elementary way. At the beginning of the war the fact was well recognized in this country that the American aeronautical engineers were not equal in training and experience to those of our Allies—principally England, France and Italy—nor those of Germany. This is no reflection on the Americans, because in the past eighteen months they have undoubtedly caught up and today are little if any behind in matters of practical design or construction. With but little governmental assistance, private individuals and the airplane companies that have been for some time engaged in the manufacture of airplanes, have developed highly satisfactory types, but these planes are only now approaching a point where they could be utilized by our Government. The Government has not availed itself of the services of these men as it should have done; but it is not the purpose of this article to discuss

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reasons why. It is to be hoped, however, that the men in question will now be given an opportunity by the Government to study at first hand the wonderful progress in aviation that has been made in European countries during the past four years. These men should be sent to Europe at Government expense, and educated fully in the design and construction of airplanes, including their motors and accessories. The Army has developed, particularly among the younger officers, many men who have demonstrated their ability as aeronautical engineers, and these men have not had a fair chance to show what they can do. Since we entered the war, they have in small numbers been offered opportunities for study by the Allied Governments, and it remains only to give them the opportunity to continue their investigations and experiments to secure for our Army the nucleus of a wonderful organization.

I have no sympathy with the theory that has been advanced as the reason for not utilizing the services of these men to better advantage, namely, that they lacked ability and experience. This was not their fault, nor is there any reason to believe that, if placed on an equality with the European engineers, they would not have produced just as good, if not better, designs and types of aircraft than our European friends. A rich nation like ours can afford to expend for purposes of national defence vast sums of money in research and experimental work, which no private individual could hope to equal, and in times past our representatives in Washington who reflected the attitude of their constituents have been unwilling to grant the necessary appropriations. Only a national emergency, like that of the great war, was sufficient to loosen the purse strings, and this was done too late to have much effect in the present war.

The Senate and the Hughes investigations of aircraft production have undoubtedly developed many unsavory examples of mismanagement and abuse of power. In spite of this, had the war lasted until next March, the United States would have been equipped with an aerial fleet that would have been sufficient to crush the Central Powers without assistance from any of our Allies. We have skilled aviators by the thousand and the necessary complement of mechanics. We are in a position to produce such vast quantities of efficient airplanes and motors during the coming winter that we could entirely have overcome the enemy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now that the war is over, the Government, naturally, will cancel many contracts for the production of aircraft and motors, and it is right that it should do this. There is no commercial demand for such a vast number of machines. But if the airplane industry is not supported by Government expenditures, it will disappear as quickly as it has appeared. The great majority of factories working on airplane material have been adapted for airplane purposes by converting plants producing commercial articles somewhat similar in nature. These factories will, of course, get back to their own line of endeavor. On the other hand, there are many factories that have been especially built, or which, prior to the war, were designed and equipped exclusively for the manufacture of aircraft, and are not in any way suitable for others purposes. In such factories Government contracts should be placed sufficient to enable them to remain in operation.

The experimental work must be continued if we are to remain in a position to defend ourselves. The possibility of a world-wide disarmament is an extremely vague hope. If we are to have a military establishment it must be of the best, and those elements of defence that require the greatest advance preparation must receive the first consideration. Aeronautics certainly falls within this class. The aircraft investigation will undoubtedly be pushed to a definite conclusion and not left in its present status. The public are not satisfied. They demand to know more regarding the manner in which the war was conducted, and doubtless they will have this wish gratified.

From the beginning of the war, until now, there has not been a single man on the Aircraft Board who had any previous practical training in aeronautics. The men who have held the reins of power have been automobile men, bankers, and army officers selected solely for their executive ability. Is it possible that during the past ten years of experiment we have not developed in this country a single man who has the combined technical knowledge and executive ability at least to entitle him to a place on an Aircraft Board composed of seven members?

Let us try to build up; not tear down. Our country should be what some one in the French Army, in reference to aircraft, so aptly described as "Under the Protecting Wings."

EARLE REMINGTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE RED CROSS MOVEMENT

BY H. ADDINGTON BRUCE

FEW phases of the Great War are more significant from a psychological or sociological point of view than the sudden blossoming of the American Red Cross into a national organization of stupendous magnitude. Three years ago the Red Cross had a membership of only twenty-two thousand. Today it has twenty-three million members, and, as I write, it is about to begin a "drive" expected to double, and more than double, its present enrollment. According to an official estimate recently given me, five million people are now working in Red Cross establishments on both sides of the Atlantic, and perhaps fifteen million more are assisting at their homes in Red Cross activities. Besides all of which, the American people have contributed upwards of three hundred million dollars to the support of the Red Cross since the United States became a participant in the war. Here, assuredly, is a remarkable social phenomenon that raises an interesting problem—the problem of explaining adequately this marvellous response to the Red Cross appeal, and of evaluating its significance correctly.

One solution, of course, that lies ready at hand is to see in it an unusually impressive instance of the power of " suggestion " and " psychic contagion." On this theory, in order to understand the amazing spread of the Red Cross movement it would only be necessary to postulate the persuasiveness of an exceptionally well organized propaganda, acting on the imitative tendency common to mankind. And suggestion was undeniably the immediate dynamic factor. But this leaves untouched the deeper problem of the peculiar effectiveness of suggestion in this particular case. Why did the suggestion to give and to toil for the Red Cross " take," and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why did it take so hard? Responsivity to a suggested idea does not depend solely on the skill with which that idea is suggested, though many people seem to think that it does.

Suggestion, in fact, is popularly regarded as an almost magic force, of irresistible potency when rightly applied. Actually there must always be present, on the part of the suggestee, an ardent, however subconscious, desire to respond to a given suggestion. Otherwise suggestion, no matter how deft its presentation, will beat forever against a stone wall of negativism. This, incidentally, explains why suggestion often fails in the treatment of functional nervous and mental maladies, a field of action in which as a rule it is notably efficacious. When, as frequently happens, nervous or mental symptoms give their victim certain advantages—such as being a centre of sympathetic interest and attention—which would be lost if relief from the symptoms were gained, a subconscious desire to cling to them may prove altogether too strong for suggestion to overcome. When, on the other hand, a favoring desire is present and dominant, no great skill in the applying of suggestion is required to secure the end in view. In the present instance, obviously, the suggested idea, "Give to the Red Cross, work for the Red Cross, sacrifice for the Red Cross," must have accorded with deepseated and intense desires. If this had not been the case the systematized campaigns of suggestion in behalf of the Red Cross could never have been so abundantly fruitful.

As the figures cited indicate, all classes of American society have responded, with money and personal service. Men of the highest ability in professional and business life have volunteered without pay to direct the workings of the Red Cross organization. Women of wealth and social prestige, hitherto leading sheltered and perhaps not altogether profitable lives, have in the service of the Red Cross labored without thought of self, displaying powers of endurance which none suspected in them. Many, indeed, have left homes of luxury, cheerfully to undergo privation, to risk, and not infrequently to lay down, life itself. And when undivided service could not be given to the Red Cross, hundreds of thousands of people have willingly superimposed Red Cross work on the routine tasks of their regular occupations. After a day of strenuous effort, business men, housewives, clerks, shopgirls, factory workers, men and women in every walk of life, have devoted their precious evening hours to labor for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Red Cross. Small wonder that I have more than once heard it said, "To become actively identified with the Red Cross is almost a religion in America today." Giving emphasis to this statement is the yearning anxiety shown by some to have their dead as well as themselves included in Red Cross membership. Thus a Massachusetts mother writes to the executive of a Red Cross chapter:

The three living members of my family—my husband, son, and self—are Red Cross members, and I long to enlist in the memory of my other lovely son, who, I cannot say that he is dead, but just away, for in my heart he still lives. I think of him faring on, as dear, in my love up there, as my love while here. I think of him in the same loving way. If he was with his dear ones now he would wish to do his "bit," for he was a loyal boy. Please accept, "in the memory of my dear Ralph," the one dollar, for humanity's sake. Then I can put the other red cross on my banner, to make the number complete. For the circle is not broken, although the empty chair is in my home.

"For humanity's sake" is in truth the motive which most people would advance if asked to state their reason for supporting the Red Cross by money or by service, or by both money and service. But this hardly goes to the heart of the matter. The Red Cross, remember, is not of recent origin. It was founded as long ago as 1864, and organized in the United States in 1881. After various vicissitudes it was re-organized as a national American institution in 1905, with the President of the United States at its head. Again and again it has demonstrated, at home and abroad, in time of war and in time of peace, its superlative value as an agency for the saving of life and the relief of suffering. But as recently as 1915 Miss Mabel T. Boardman could state, in her history of the Red Cross:

As yet this national association of ours, which belongs to the country and to the people, is in its infancy. Lusty and vigorous it is true, but lacking still the size and development it must attain before it is a worthy representative of these United States of America. It has twenty-two thousand members. Eighteen hundred thousand men, women, and children of Japan constitute the membership of the Japanese Red Cross. Hundreds of thousands manifest their love of country in other lands by adhesion to the ranks of their national association. Our American Red Cross has less than a million dollar endowment fund. The permanent endowment of the Japanese Red Cross is nearly thirteen million dollars. The Russian society before the present war had a reserve capital of nineteen million dollars. And the funds of several other European associations are far more than those of our own. In a country of such wealth, of such patriotism and humanity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as this, the American people cannot allow their Red Cross to remain without a just endowment. They give with the utmost liberality to local charities, to hospitals, to universities and colleges; but they have yet to learn to express the love for their country by their gifts to the organization which stands as the embodiment of patriotism both in war and peace.

The lesson would certainly seem to have been learned since these words were written. And the stimulus to the learning, needless to say, was America's shift from neutrality to belligerency. This alone, however, would not suffice to explain the astonishing zeal forthwith shown for the formerly neglected Red Cross. To explain this, special circumstances have to be taken into consideration, not the least important being the educative influence of the events of the first two years of the Great War—the years of America's neutrality—in appealing with unprecedented force to the humanitarian impulses of American men and women, and at the same time in giving them a lively consciousness of the imminence of the peril in which the world, their country, and they themselves were placed by the German onslaught. By the time the United States got into the war, Americans did not have to be told that this was no ordinary conflict between nations. They knew that on its outcome depended not merely the safety of America, but the safety of civilization itself. That is to say, the instincts alike of self-preservation and of race preservation, the egocentric and the gregarious instincts, were so aroused as to make action of some sort imperative on every American.

It is a biological and psychological truism that trouble results when any instinct is thwarted in finding adequate expression. This is peculiarly true of the gregarious instinct, in which such qualities as altruism, patriotism, conscience, and the sense of duty are rooted. When, in consequence of any circumstance that causes an overdevelopment of the egocentric at the expense of the gregarious instinct, people lead uncommonly self-centered lives, they are invariably discontented, restless, and unhappy, and may even be harried into conditions of serious ill-health. Many, if not all, of the functional disorders so much in evidence in the modern world, are now known to be the product of an undue repression of the gregarious instinct, and the experienced physician makes it a point to try to guide nervous sufferers into activities that will give this instinct free play. This is why the so-called " sym-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pathy cure" is so efficacious in numerous cases of nervousness. The self-centred neurotic who can be induced to engage in charitable or other altruistic activities, finds relief through altruism from his symptoms simply because he thereby gives expression to the gregarious instinct that has tormented him into nervousness as a punishment for his failure to give it expression at all. Man is so built that he must have the consciousness of being of service to his fellow-man, else he will be driven to eccentricities of thought and behavior injurious to himself and to society. And the necessity for this consciousness is intensified in time of war or other great crisis, in proportion as the gravity of the crisis carries with it a realization that the nation's future is at stake. That is to say, when the war is a little war, the compulsion of the gregarious instinct is far less keenly felt than when the war is a big one. Men can more readily go about their ordinary affairs, without being troubled by the feeling that they should be personally striving to insure the winning of the war.

The war that began in the summer of 1914 was not a little war. It was a big war. In fact, it speedily made itself recognized as the biggest of all wars. The stirring of the gregarious instinct was correspondingly strong, and consequently there was an imperative need for directive action that would enable all to satisfy this stirring. In England, as Trotter has recently pointed out, the need in question was at first not properly appreciated. Large sections of the community, incapable of actual military service, were given neither guidance nor opportunity to contribute directly to the national defense, with consequences concerning which Trotter justly observes:

> It must surely be clear that in a nation engaged in an urgent struggle for existence, the presence of a large class who are as sensitive as any to the call of the herd, and yet cannot respond in any active way, contains very grave possibilities. The only response to that relentless calling that can give peace is in service; if that be denied, restlessness, uneasiness, and anxiety must necessarily follow. To such a mental state are very easily added impatience, discontent, exaggerated fears, pessimism, and irritability. It must be remembered that large numbers of such individuals were persons of importance in peace time, and retain a great deal of their prestige under the social system we have decided to maintain, although in war time they are obviously without function. This group of idle and flustered parasites has formed a nucleus from which have proceeded some of the many outbursts of disunion which have done so much to prevent this country from developing her resources with smoothness and continuity. It is not sug-

Univ. of Tulsa Library
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gested that these eruptions of discontent are due to any kind of disloyalty; they are the result of defective morale, and bear all the evidences of coming from persons whose instinctive response to the call of the herd has been frustrated and who, therefore, lack the strength and composure of those whose souls are uplifted by a satisfactory instinctive activity. Moral instability has been characteristic of all the phenomena of disunion we are now considering.

In our own country manifestations of a frustrating of the gregarious instinct have not been entirely absent during the war. But they have been less in evidence and less detrimental than in England, for the reason that in our country, from the day we became involved in the colossal struggle for world freedom, guidance and opportunity were given enabling the people as a whole to respond to " the call of the herd " by becoming active war workers and war helpers. To this end the signal favor shown the Red Cross by the Government, and the official stressing of the value of the Red Cross as a war time organization, were important steps—steps so important that they must be regarded as amounting almost to a stroke of genius. For the Red Cross was an agency admirably calculated to afford not only universal, but also thoroughly satisfying, expression of the gregarious instinct. More than this, it was an agency with which the people were thoroughly familiar and which they already held in high esteem.

If, in the pre-war period, they had shown no burning ardor to enlist under the banner of the Red Cross, this was not because they were at that time unaware of its worth. It was because, to be quite frank, the pre-war period was one in which the egocentric instinct was somewhat overdeveloped—as indicated, for example, by the prevalence not alone of functional nervous and mental disorders, but also of vice, crime, and insanity, all of which in the last analysis are social evils born of an abnormal egocentricism. But though the egocentric instinct then was undoubtedly dominant, the gregarious still had enough vitality to function under stress, and any local, national, or extra-national calamity brought forth prompt and convincing proof of this. Again and again, as occasion arose, the gregarious instinct had thus functioned through the Red Cross, which consequently was definitely associated in the popular mind with the relief of suffering. It was no new, unknown, untried organization. It had behind it a long and honorable record

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of service. Its very symbol—the cross—was itself linked with the noblest traditions and sublimest aspirations of mankind. The happy accident which led to the choosing of this symbol—a desire to compliment Switzerland, where the first Red Cross conference was held in 1864—must be accounted one of the most providential of accidents, from a psychological point of view. No symbol could more surely appeal to the best in the people of Christendom.

With the history of the Red Cross what it was, with the special endorsement it had received from the war-making Government, and with the gregarious instinct aroused in America as it had never been before, we need no longer wonder at the sudden and nationwide enthusiasm shown for the Red Cross. "Suggestion" and "psychic contagion" had a truly fertile field in which to work. There were no contrary ideas to be dislodged, no opposing desires to be overcome. Excepting in persons of superlative self-absorption, the gregarious had for the time complete dominance over the egocentric. "How can I serve?" was the question consciously or subconsciously foremost in virtually everybody's mind. "Join the Red Cross," was one almost self-evident answer. Under the conjoint influence of instinct and of organized campaigning in behalf of the Red Cross, it became an answer, as we know, translated into affirmative, joyfully co-operative action by millions of men and women.

The psychology of the Red Cross movement is thus, after all, comparatively simple, based as it is in human elementals. But the fact of its simplicity should not mask from us its tremendous importance in relation to what may be called racial dynamics. If, after peace has been fully restored, the recently developed enthusiasm for the Red Cross is allowed to die down, if the men and women who have so generously given to, and so devotedly toiled for, the Red Cross, are permitted to revert to the self-centred modes prevalent before the war, then America will have let slip a golden opportunity to lay surer her foundations for the future. The gregarious instinct, the instinct which bids all men strive for the common good, may not need to function so intensely after the war, but there can be no doubt that it ought to function just as continuously. It ought to function, too, with much more intensity than it commonly did in the days that preceded the spiritual awakening forced on the world by the war. The class hatreds which have wrought such destruction in Russia

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and elsewhere are an echo of those materialistic days, and their extension to still other countries must be expected if the gregarious instinct atrophy once more. In the Red Cross we now have an institution whose activities make directly for mass as contrasted with class solidarity. To keep the Red Cross in constant and vigorous operation should become an object of national concern and national planning.

From the viewpoint of individual as well as of national well-being, maintenance of the Red Cross in energetic activity is also much to be desired. As already mentioned, failure to give adequate expression to an instinct breeds trouble, and in particular breeds nervous strain. Life begins to seem "stale, flat, and unprofitable," and unless the thwarted instinct contrives to express itself in some way, disorders of feeling and of conduct develop. Our Freudian friends have been at great pains to make clear to us the mischief which ensues when the sex instinct is perpetually baulked, denied expression even through what the Freudians term "sublimation." The gregarious instinct is as imperious in its demands, as vengeful when persistently and absolutely repressed. Urging men to be of service, to lead lives productive of good to the race, at all times and not in war time only, those who remain deaf to its urging must pay a penalty of some kind. When, however, its demands are heeded, a compensatory feeling of satisfaction is gained, and more than this, a loosening of energy which until then had been unavailable.

This accounts for the remarkable "staying powers" unexpectedly displayed by so many Red Cross workers during the past four years. It accounts also for the improved health and increased happiness so many have found after taking up Red Cross work. The anxious restlessness, the feeling of being "sick of things," the chronic dissatisfaction they have been experiencing, oppress them no more. And this even when the Red Cross duties imposed on them have been arduous, unpleasant, perhaps of a character that would ordinarily have been repellant to them. The secret is that through the Red Cross they have been enabled to give to the gregarious instinct the expression it failed to find in their lives before the war. The mere knowledge that one is actually of use in the world is itself an energy developer of the first order. When to this is added knowledge that one is of use in race preservation through the conquest of disease and the alleviation of pain, energy may be developed in almost incredible degree.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Obviously, ample scope for Red Cross effort will remain after the last war victim has been succored. Before the war, for that matter, the Red Cross was doing not a little humanitarian work day in and day out, notably in the way of nursing, co-operating in the prevention of industrial accidents, and promoting health education among the people. This work and kindred effort should now be intensified and extended, for the sake both of those among our millions who need to be helped and of those who will benefit by sharing in the helping. It would in truth be a sad mistake—I am tempted to say, a crime against the nation—if after the war the Red Cross were permitted to fade to a mere shadow of its present splendid self.

H. Addington Bruce.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEXICO TO-DAY

BY WILLIAM GATES

I

WHAT is the position of Mexico to-day as to the all-dominant questions in the world? The attitude of her government to these questions, and to us? What is the actual status of the Carranza Government in Mexico itself? Is it solving the economic, social, agrarian and political problems of the Revolution; stimulating industry and development; and with sound financial methods? Is it a government surrounded by disorder yet gaining in strength; is that disorder substantially "banditry," or a coherent political movement? Does this Government correspond to those aspirations of the people for democracy and freedom which it was expected to fulfill? And is it going to succeed?

What is the actual fact about the German propaganda of which so much has been said and so little actually told? Is the government, and President Carranza personally, neutral, or pro-German? Are the Mexican people pro-German, or pro-Ally? And what is their real feeling for us.

In short, what is going on in Mexico?

Every question to be solved for the good or ill of the world in Europe is also to be found in an acute form here. Racial and national independence and right to self-determination of their own politics and affairs; trade and development questions of every kind; militarism; I. W. W. socialism; the religious question between Church and State; a land question to which Ireland's is a new-born infant, in age, acuteness, and irreconcilability; a mixture of racial questions only paralleled in Austria: these are some of the elements of the problem that oppresses the Mexican people in its 400-year effort to arrive at a solution of its necessities and hopes. And the problem by the side of which the Carranza Government is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trying to maintain itself. The answer to these problems must be known and comprehended if we are to deal rightly, and with good for the future, not only with Mexican questions, but with those of all Latin America.

Eighty-odd per cent of Mexicans have Indian blood; 40 per cent are pure blood, and another 20 per cent live and feel "Indian"; 85 per cent are illiterate; some 2,000,000 do not even speak Spanish. Officially Mexico is Latin and Catholic; really it is neither, no more than Austria is German. The aristocracy is still Spanish and Catholic, but all the rest is not; the Indian part is still pagan in all essentials, with a thin varnish of new names. The Mexican "patriotism" we have heard so much of is a *political* sentiment, born of resistance to foreign exploitation in a territory only united in political administration by the foreign conqueror. It is lauded and waved by the class known as "*valiente.*" Take away that class, a small minority of the population, and "Mexico" as an entity would cease to exist, just as will Austria. The *home-land* feeling we know is that of the Zapotec or Oaxacan, the Maya or Yucatecan, the Bohemian, the Yugo-Slav, the Pole. And to this day, all the legislation of Mexico has been founded exclusively on the ideas and needs of the population of European blood, the natives having been abandoned even more radically in this respect since Independence than under Spanish rule.

It is this Mexican "common people" *in whose name* this last Revolution has been nominally waged; for whom President Wilson has spoken and to whose efforts he has offered our sympathy. And it is this hypersensitive inheritance of Mexican consciousness which Carranza phrased in a sentence uttered by him as he came to power: "These foreigners have got to quit making money out of Mexico." By all rights the present Mexican Government and ours should be in the closest sympathy and coöperation. Why, then, are we having (if we are) trouble with the Carranza Government?

The two "monsters beyond all pale" in Carrancista literature are Huerta and Zapata. Huerta would be President of Mexico to-day but for Wilson. Zapata is an Indian whose sole object is to win back illegally dispossessed farms for his followers in his native State, and at the critical period would have recognized Carranza had the latter guaranteed him in that desire; Carranza refused, was driven to Vera Cruz, after which we recognized his government, sold him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arms, gave his troops transport in our territory, and shut off arms from his opponents. What is the trouble now?

We have seen that there are two phases of the "anti-foreign exploitation" spirit, the popular and internal, or agrarian, directed against the Spanish and Creole upper classes, with the almost universally Spanish-born administrators and storekeepers, whose oppression was felt at every turn and hour; the other political-international, wherein we now bear the brunt, with the English second. The first is a phase of the "home-land" patriotism of the great peasant majority, and the second a phase of the political patriotism of the "valiente" mestizo class. Of these two phases, Zapata represents the former, and Carranza the latter.

After the fall of Huerta, the Aguascalientes Convention called by Carranza proved intractable, and he withdrew, leaving the capital to Villa and Zapata. The Plan de Guadalupe, under which Carranza led the revolt against Huerta, named no other object than that, he being only First Chief and, on success, Provisional President to call elections and restore "the interrupted Constitutional order." Zapata's Plan de Ayala was a thorough-going agrarian revindication against the internal exploiters. Villa issued no "Plan," but fought for the same objects as Zapata. Neither one sought the Presidency at any time. The year from October, 1914, to October, 1915, when we recognized Carranza, was marked by various efforts at union, which all came to naught for just one reason. Zapata was willing to recognize Carranza even as permanent President, provided he would commit himself to the agrarian revindication; Carranza refused, and demanded unconditional submission to "the Plan de Guadalupe"—that is, himself as Provisional President to reorganize the government, *policies* "to be settled afterwards." Villa and Obregon proposed to recognize Carranza as Provisional President, with provision that neither generals in command, nor provisional governors nor *President* should be eligible in the new elections. Carranza says the latter question is of "too transcendental importance to be discussed by three or four persons, but must be reserved to the sovereign competency of the whole nation"; that he must be recognized without further qualifications, all questions of policies to come later. Villa then disavows Carranza.

The Villa-Zapata Conventio Government holds the capital with two short interruptions until August, reorganizing gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernmental administration, restoring effective municipal local freedom (one of the main issues of the revolt against Diaz), putting agrarian small-proprietorship plans into extended operation, with an Agricultural Loan Bank on our general lines to help the farmer; and also working out in Convention a thorough legislative proyecto. This proposed legislation was not extreme in any point but the agrarian; it gave full consideration to international rights, and was not anti-foreign; it was in general a good liberal plan covering the fundamental social principles of the Revolution. It was very liberal to Labor, but after a vigorous four days' debate showing excellent comprehension of the issues, the Convention agreed by 55 to 24 on Government recognition of workingmen's unions, including the right to strike, but refused to recognize the Syndicates (branches of the Casa de Obrero Mundial, or the I. W. W.), or to permit sabotage. Through the whole Zapata period the dominant topic in the papers is the agrarian question in theory and practical institution: building up a self-responsible small farming class. There is almost no anti-Americanism in the papers; the "enemy" is the old Cientifico party, the economic *Mexican* exploiters of the old régime.

With the entry of Carranza forces August 2 all this changed. Even prior to that date there had been a signed pact between the Casa de Obrero Mundial and the Constitutionalist Government (signed, I think, by Luis Cabrera for the latter), making a full offensive and defensive alliance. Entering the capital the Zapata papers are at once suppressed, and their plants used to issue Carranza papers; these begin at once to be filled with new kinds of notices. Agrarianism almost disappears, to be replaced by the spread of I. W. W. syndicates, "to become a great aid in combating the tyrants." We have wild stories of "revolutions" in the United States. Kenneth Turner arrives, on the invitation of Dr. Atl, the I. W .W. propagandist. August 22 the present German Minister, von Eckhardt, arrives at the capital with letters from Carranza (still at Vera Cruz), stating that von Eckhardt has come "accredited to the Constitutionalist Government." (*We* did not recognize Carranza until October 19.)

A Dr. Krumm-Heller arrives at the same time, and begins at once a course of violent speeches before Casa Obrero Mundial meetings, praising Germany's economic success and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kultur, attacking the United States, and also attacking our Red Cross, which had come during the Zapata period to relieve the frightful existing distress, and been then welcomed and aided. Krumm-Heller declares the Red Cross workers are spreading false and injurious reports of the situation: that is, that the people were starving, just to give excuse for our getting into Mexico for our own purposes, the "so-called distress being entirely exaggerated, and the alleged needy only cheats." (For the facts, see the full official Red Cross Reports.) Our Red Cross was impeded in every way, and finally Carranza asked its recall, on the aforesaid grounds, and that the Mexican Government was doing all that was necessary.

With the definitive coming into power, therefore, of the Carranza régime, we find at his side the German Minister and the I. W. W., in their official capacities, and in full coöperation and recognition. We find starting up at once an exaggerated anti-Americanism, of the "political patriotism" type; the beginning of a military pretorianism of which I shall have more to note later; a flat disregard for international courtesies, to say the least, which receives later a very marked development. And finally we have what I think I may call "agrarian revindication tied to the wheels of politics." There is a frequent blowing of trumpets, with accompanying "functions," over the re-allotment to this or that pueblo of *ejidos,* or commonalty farm lands. Carranza could not indeed possibly evade the land question, nor do I believe he desired to. But Zapata had installed a special cabinet Minister of Agriculture and Colonization, who pushed the work, it must be acknowledged, both in and out of season, and thereby made Zapata much trouble, until the latter made him take a back seat in politics and devote his energies to the actual administration of the task.

In my recent trip through Mexico to see and judge for myself the inner ideas of the men at the front in her affairs—Carranza, Alvarado, Félix Díaz, Zapata—four men who with Meixueiro of Oaxaca sum up Mexico to-day, except for those who merely are getting rich out of their opportunities—my desire to see Zapata especially was stimulated by the utterly contradictory reports about him. Every form of abuse possible is heaped upon him; even in Yucatan, in the Government papers, a criminal or "bad man" is a zapatista; yet on all sides acknowledgment that Zapata is the one leader

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in all these years who has had a consistent principle. Talks with every class of person in Mexico, long leagues on horseback through Carrancista and Felicista and Zapatista territory, and exhaustive reading of the past contemporary newspapers back to Madero's time, have left no other possible conclusion than this: Zapata is fighting to restore the farms of which the Indians were by legal *processes* dispossessed in spite of primordial titles centuries old, and to establish small agricultural proprietorship, leaving the other economic problems of Mexico, for which modern capital and methods are essential, free. Zapata, Carranza, Alvarado, all proclaim agrarian revindication of the Indian. But the Indian, dispossessed, his race-brother, bulks first in Zapata's thoughts; in Carranza's and Alvarado's it is the capitalist hated, especially the foreigner, and most especially the American. The Zapata movement is a social home movement; the other a political anti-foreign one. Zapata shares the anti-Spanish feeling above mentioned, and neither he nor his people are anti-Yankee in the usual sense; he and his officers are also specifically anti-German. Alvarado is a convinced I. W. W., who expects to succeed Carranza as President, and establish the first Syndicalistic State; to both him and Carranza, Indianism is something to be cultivated and exploited politically. To be brief, it is the carpet-baggism of our Reconstruction. Manuel Gamio, Director of Archæology in Mexico, in his book, *Forging a Country,* says:

> Does the Zapatism of Morelos represent exclusively criminal banditry and pillage, or does it also stand for a tenacious desire for well-being and freedom? We must first distinguish three kinds of Zapatism: first in banditry pure and simple, which, not only in Morelos but in the whole republic, masks itself behind this and other names. Next there are the abandoned elements hanging over from other periods, which take advantage of the eternal mis-orientation of the native, to go off into criminal adventures. And finally we have the legitimate Zapatism, which were better called Indianism, for it has persisted vigorously in all Mexico since Cortes raised his standards on the shores of Villa Rica.

This was written two years ago; of the condition to-day I have this personal testimony to make: I have ridden hundreds of miles through southern Mexico, where I was told no other American had been for the last one or two years, at least, and where I was warned that it was utterly impossible to go for roving bandits, who would at the least strip me to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my shoes. I have been in a town as it was attacked by Felicistas, and seen the Carrancista soldiers after repelling the attack loot the town they were brought in to defend, the commanding general of the division, Heriberto Jara of Vera Cruz, bringing up the rear of the line of loot-burdened men; while others after shooting a prisoner found wounded in the leg, dragged him by a rope behind a cart; and while a colonel on the general's staff warned a friendly storekeeper to shut his doors, as they could not promise protection from their own troops. I never felt safe one hour of the time I was within Carranza lines; I felt safe every hour I was off among the country people, in the districts protected by their soldiers, farmers like themselves, working their fields and taking a gun when the need came to defend their homes from the marauding Carrancistas. I have no doubt there are bands of bandits, but I believe them to be mainly, at least, on the borderlines between the opposing forces. I have seen the interior quiet country life of the common people in Morelos, Vera Cruz, Pueblo and Oaxaca, where Zapata, Meixueiro and the Felicistas are maintaining a settled, orderly and peaceful administration.

Beyond doubt there have been brutalities on all sides, and by nearly all parties, but the stories of "rebel" outrages all come through Carrancistas sources, and are more than paralleled by the long list daily in the public press of acts by Carranza officers, from the shooting by a colonel of the entire Town Council of a village over a personal quarrel to the murder, robbery and nameless outrages that make Mexico City and Vera Cruz themselves unsafe. I was in Mexico City in the early part of the year; the misery, starvation and nakedness of the poor was appalling. Children, almost naked, slept on doorsteps in the business quarter, and they lay on the pavements as the sun rose to get warm again. The mark of tension and fear was characteristic; to see happy people I had to go outside into Revolutionary lines, with all their scanty resources, yet safe from "the Army."

With a budget some 100,000,000 pesos short, the Government dare not shut off either the civilian graft or the heavily padded army payrolls (paid in lump sums to the officers), nor check the license. To support the Government gives immunity, for Carranza has to have support to try to hold the Revolution in check, and the price is freedom for any excess, even to the long list of burglaries with the "gray

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

automobile," finally traced to a certain high general; all reported openly, with or without names, but left unpunished unless some political toes got stepped on, or the infractor had become otherwise politically *non grata,* so that the crime was a good chance to make a show of justice, and kill two birds. As just one case for illustration, while I was in Oaxaca the newly arrived Governor called the leading merchants and the consuls together to say that his troops had not been paid for months; that there was trouble up the line, and passage dangerous; that he had to have 25,000 pesos, not of course as a forced contribution, but as a necessity, for otherwise he could not hold his soldiers from looting. The storekeepers, the first to be likely to suffer, gave; the German consul gave 2,000 pesos; the American said he had no authority from his Government. It was a fact there was trouble up the line, and the Governor may not have had the money; but in another case where a similar contribution was made to pay several months' arrears to the teachers, it later appeared they never got a peso of the collection.

The Revolutionists of Mexico to-day are a peasant yeomanry defending their homes; while one may describe the Government forces as Germans in Belgium, or Bolsheviki in Russia; either term fits. And if Russian mujik or Zapata Indian in the heat of overthrow of the old régime were guilty both of excesses, let us distinguish that from the crimes of the common political enemy which, in each case with German alliance, has usurped the power to oppress and steal, and betrayed the revolution of the people, to sell out the country both at wholesale and at retail; and just as shamelessly as the Carranza troops regularly sell ammunition to the "rebels" when in need of "spending money," the soldiers selling by the dozen cartridges, the colonels by the case. The current price is 5 to 10 cents per cartridge, including commissions.

The ignorance in this country as to the extent of the German propaganda and influence over the border is little short of amazing. To try to show its working, take the matter of the public press. In Yucatan a free press is nonexistent; but in Mexico there is a long list of anti-government papers, rising and falling, besides the main dailies. Nearly the whole of this press is German subsidized; in some cases the anti-Americanism is virulent in the extreme, excitatory of fears of invasion. A good deal of this is hidden behind rabid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. W. W. anti-capitalism, where that is the cue, as in the oil regions and in the north; and that serves to excite strikes, or destruction; but the purchase money is traceable, and has several times been openly proven German. Some of these rabid anti-foreign papers are also anti-Carranza, to give them circulation among the Revolutionary districts; but there, too, they serve Carranza's aims, for they excite the sentiment which he hopes to use when " the Day " of vindication comes. When we learned that food shipments released by us to relieve distress were being used for outrageous profiteering, and ordered the question investigated, it gave rise to violent editorials on Mexico's sovereign right to regulate her own internal commerce.

Last January the Sonora News Co., a long established American company, obeying our Trading With the Enemy Act, cut out the most violent and shamelessly mendacious German paper from its train list. It had its whole contract cancelled in consequence, the *Government Secretary* stating in the official letter that the special reason was that such action invaded Mexico's sovereign dignity, and compromised her " strict neutrality." Other cases followed, with like action, declaring broadly that " the American Black List has no validity in Mexico," and supported immediately by specific decrees from Carranza himself. The whole question went right up to where the very next step indicated would be a demand that all foreign importing houses sell their goods to all Mexico's mercantile " guests " (understand, Germans) regardless of our War Trade Act, on the ground of Mexico's impartial neutrality and impeccable dignity. The advantage to Minister von Eckhardt of thus putting out of business allied trade in Mexico is manifest; and I believe that only expediency—the fact that in spite of our strictest efforts, Mexicans can still buy where we do not know their connections, and so the German houses are managing to keep going, even in hardware and drugs, with the fact that Mexico is absolutely dependent on us for her imports—prevented or prevents such a decree. It was the next logical step to those that had preceded, and was fully covered in principle by specific announcements. The official letter to the Sonora News Co. was flatly discourteous in its wording (I myself saw the original); and see also some letters to follow at the end of this article.

The home-land local patriotism we have referred to has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had the result in Mexico's constitutions that Sovereignty is declared to reside in the States. Their right is even to secede. Carranza, disavowing Huerta as usurper, in his character of governor of Coahuila, was declared the " only legal personality within the Constitutional order." In 1915 Luis Cabrera, speaking in Merida, told the Yucatecans that it " was not wrong to think of state independence, if the central Government did not give them justice." In the Fall of 1914 the State of Oaxaca recognized the Carranza party; nevertheless, in November, one Jimenez Figueroa, arriving to enlist troops for Carranza, appeared at the palace a few days later with his soldiers, arrested and dispossessed the State officials, dissolved the Legislature, and proclaimed himself military governor. One of the officials was Guillermo Meixueiro, son of a former governor of the State, a nearly pure blood Zapotec, a lawyer, of high education and some fortune. Escaping by a balcony, he gathered a force from the Sierras and drove Figueroa out. Figueroa was later shot, and was disavowed by Carranza, but the general belief is that it was only because he had failed. At any rate, the Oaxacans still remained adherents of the Carranza party.

At the following elections, Meixueiro was elected governor, but resigned to serve in the field, José I. Davila being elected to succeed him. In June, 1915, disgusted with the general anarchy, and Carranza's inability to enforce his orders on his own generals, the Legislature and State Government, in exercise of their full constitutional rights, decreed that: " Until the constitutional order is re-established in the Republic, the Free and Sovereign State of Oaxaca reassumes its sovereignty, and will continue governing in the observation of the Constitution of 1857, with all its standing laws and procedures." This was exactly parallel to Carranza's action as governor of Coahuila, only much more formal; it was also duly followed by local issues of postage stamps, gold, silver and copper money, and also paper. *But,* Carranza sent a force under Governor Castro of Chiapas, the present Secretary of War, and after a campaign of some length, the State government was driven up into the mountains to the north and east.

There they still are, despite all efforts of the Carranza Government to dislodge them, protected by and protecting the native population in peace. In the city of Oaxaca I was told it was impossible to go overland to the Isthmus, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thence to Guatemala as I wished, for the irresponsible bandits everywhere. I found the whole State clear down to the Carranza lines on the Tehuantepec railroad in peace, and happy. Feeling it unwise to say anything of my wishes to my American friends, for their sakes, I went to Mitla, spent a few days at the ruins, and on meeting a couple of Sierra Zapatec Indians from over the hills, gave them my bags, and walked out one midday while the soldiers were at dinner on the other side of the town. In a few hours I was behind the hills, and that night way up in the mountains, sending my compliments by telephone over the peaks to General Meixueiro.

No real information gets across the border and into our press, but the following summary is absolutely incontrovertible by the positive evidence on every side, and is the unanimous opinion of everyone in Mexico, except those who are exploiting the Carranza régime. By that I mean not only the mass of foreigners of every nationality save German, but the mass of Mexicans themselves, including a very large number of government attachés, whose bread and butter, or life, forces their silence.

Carranza's policy has from the first been founded on the phrase I quoted: These foreigners have got to quit making money out of Mexico. His international policy has been not to build up friendship with us, but to divide all Latin America on the old European idea of the balance of power between two hostile groups, placing Mexico (with himself in the chair of Porfirio Díaz) at the head of this Latin revindication against the Yankee peril, and availing himself of Germany as his support. Every high military and civil officer is pro-German, except General Pablo González; it is said he urged a different policy on the President, only to be told, " I will not abandon my best friend (Germany)." The army is German in sympathy and tendencies; wearing of buttons with the Kaiser's picture is common; *they have all expected Germany to win;* and then would be Mexico's time, and theirs. Our friendly Guatemala, where President Estrada Cabrera, though a dictator, gives as good a government as can be asked under conditions, and whose policy has always been " to make friends with and protect the Indians in their home economic life " has specifically come in for Carranza's bitter hatred. Carranza soldiers invaded Guatemala some time ago; but did not get out. And a signed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement with Salvador to invade Guatemala from both sides, Mexico to get some of the interior territory Alvarado needs for exploitation, and Salvador a port on the Caribbean, is common talk; it is heard everywhere, both in Mexico and Guatemala, and with a suggestion that some outside influence prevented its consummation. As to other diplomatic efforts, in which Manuel Ugarte, with his Pan-Latinism, and our exceedingly able traveler, Luis Cabrera, have had their part, one cannot here speak. But I can quote from two letters, the originals of which I was permitted to see. The first was written by a man in Mexico City, a Mexican, in position to get first-hand knowledge of events, to a friend in the south, a Mexican:

Feb. 5, 1918. I to-day confirm my impressions of the terrible situation in which Mexico finds herself from the outrages and robberies of the Carrancista soldiers and officers. It is demonstrated clearly that the neutral policy of Carranza is solely a chimera, a pretext, for having seen for some time that his government must rely on the support of one or the other belligerent in the present war, he took decidedly the side of the Central Empires, without our being able as yet to see all his reasons; though for my part it seems because of the suggestions of his chief military officers who admire the attitude of the Germans, with Ugarte and their other admirers who never cease saying we must never forget 1847. We know that the German Minister offered Carranza 60,000,000 dollars, elements to equip an army of 400,000 men, and a seat in the council of world peace to reclaim the rights of the Mexicans in the United States. The negotiations of Nieto in Washington were a failure, in spite of the contrary as asserted by the Carrancista press, for it seems that they are coming to suspect Carranza's real attitude. Mexico will have to be a faithful ally of Germany, to the detriment of her sympathies.

Feb. 27, 1918. All the revolutionary leaders of the north and south are now united for the restoration of our great Constitution of 1857; but we must not be asleep, for though the public opinion is unanimous against Carranza and his circle of bandits and assassins, we must look out for the final convulsions which will mark the agony of Carrancismo, for these men are capable of anything so long as they can continue a little longer in robbing the public posts; and there is much talk of a secret treaty between Carranza and the Republic of Salvador to invite the greater number of American nations to the taking of decisive action against the United States, and in favor of Germany, which is paying for these steps on Carranza's part. In all this we see that an international conflict is very easy. The enemies now have wireless communication direct with the Germans; and this, with the other acts of Carranza, can place us later at the mercy of the United States, which will consider us as their enemies *on account of the imprudence of this group.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The two following letters were written by an old schoolmate of General Meixueiro, an Oaxacan, as shown by the deference to the *patria chica,* and a personage intimately close to Carranza; the letters themselves show themselves written at the latter's direction. Note also the fact that in them General Meixueiro is given his full official title as General of Division (of the Oaxaca State forces) thus treating him as a *belligerent;* compare what has been said herein on State sovereignty and the Oaxaca action. The letters use the " thou " of close personal intimacy, and were written a short time before I passed through Oaxaca last Spring. General Meixueiro showed me the letters and permitted me to take the copies:

Señor General of Division, Lic. Guillermo Meixueiro: wherever he may be found.

My dear friend: I begin this letter giving you the general status of our position, which is complicated by the European war. The Government inclines to the German side, and the numerous colony living in the United States, by the law of economic gravitation, will bring what capital they can save, and in self-preservation will cross our borders to take refuge in Mexico. Besides, it appears that our country will be the point of concentration of all the Teutons in America, in view of the fact that the other American nations have placed themselves on the side of the Allies. The Government has 24 towers for wireless telegraphy, cartridge-making machinery directed by Germans, a school and shop for aviation, also in German charge, so that we are involved in the greatest contest known to history.

In view of the reinforcements which our Government receives in capital and men, for every German is a soldier, for the future war in our territory, I have believed proper to treat with you on the delicate question of the political problem of Oaxaca. I know your valor and sincerity, your love for Oaxaca, your disinterested aims, and all that I have reviewed in my mind before writing you the present letter. If there be any error of appreciation on my part, pardon it, for no other thing guides me than love for the *patrio chica* and my affection for the friend and brother of my infancy.

The same official person whom I presented to you in Nov., 1915, intervenes in the present matter. At that time there was considered an approachment between the element of the Oaxaca Sovereignty which you represent, and the Government de facto, the same matter as is now in consideration; and if an agreement were arrived at, it would be with the Central Constitutional Government on the eve of its establishment. This government is well disposed to arrive at an understanding; but in view of the fact that the former time when propositions were made, no agreement was reached because you did not reply, to-day I desire to know what are your desires or conditions to start an ending of the contest. You will understand that the discussion includes the effective guarantees which shall be enjoyed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you and the other officers who operate under your orders, of the matter of confiscated interest, liberty of person, of the establishment of the Constitutional Authorities in Oaxaca by means of new elections; and it has also been considered that until an agreement is arrived at, you may continue your revolutionary efforts, without being charged with perfidy. Finally, the matter was put upon the board that if the security of your person and family or the education of your children should require, as precautionary means on your part, your living outside of Mexico, you will be indemnified for all the damage you have received in your interests during this long period, as a mark of the fact that your revolution has pursued no other than a political end.

General Meixueiro's answer will be gathered from the following reply:

Señor General, Lic. Guillermo Meixueiro, Ixtlán de Juárez. Very dear friend:

I have your valued letter of recent date, by which I see that in spite of our initiatives you still do not consent to an agreement with our Government because you do not consider it legitimate, and because you believe that its policy is not the one beneficial to Mexico in these critical moments. You desire that the Constitution of 1857 be reëstablished, and say that everything that is being done is null because Carranza had no authority to set aside that Constitution and substitute that of Querétaro. That is a matter of opinion, and you should consider that the new political code given to the Republic, rather than a new constitution is only a reform of that of 1857, a reform of much timeliness, principally in what touches the clergy and the foreigners, for these are absorbing many of the rights of Mexicans. Study it calmly.

With respect to the political actuation of our Government, I have read your arguments, and I do not see how you can forget the offenses we have suffered from our northern neighbor. You say that Governments should not act from mere sympathies or antipathies nor from a spirit of vengeance, and that those who are our enemies to-day may to-morrow be our best friends. But, do you believe that the Yankees can ever be our friends? Disenchant yourself, my dear friend; the Yankees do not love us; what they love is our wealth and our territory and they will take it whenever they can, and the present Government does right in taking its precautions—yet with prudence in order not to precipitate a rupture *before the time,* for an immediate rupture with the neighboring Republic would swamp us. At this moment we need building iron for factories which does not come because Mexico does not define her attitude, and our neighbors think the iron is for Germany. We need the paper from the National Paper and Type Co. that our press may not disappear. Remember, too, that our drugs and a large part of the food of Mexico comes from the United States; we must, therefore, move with caution. Ugarte went away as Private Secretary of the President on a secret mission. Do not insist on your position and aid us for the unification of all Mexican parties.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the conflicts between your forces and the Constitutionalists who are in Oaxaca are suspended, the blood thus spared will serve for another and *proximate occasion.*

These letters represent the two sides of Mexico in the question. In support of this, I talked during the latter part of 1917 and the first half of 1918 with every class of Mexican, from Indians to planters of the old régime in Yucatan, and Cientificos in Mexico, and moderates everywhere, as well as constant talks with Alvaradists and Carrancista officers and officials; I rode all through southern Mexico, seeing the ordinary daily life of the people, talking with all classes of revolutionaries from soldiers and petty officers to Félix Díaz, Zapata and Meixueiro, and spending full time discussing with these leaders and their subordinates the present situation in every respect. Mexico, outside of Carrancista circles, is our friend; it is also in desperation, and crying to us; it is absolutely pro-Ally, and anti-German. The case is a clear one: the Carranza policy is a political one, against us, to which he is sacrificing the inner condition of the country; but the Mexicans outside his ranks see that alliance with Germany would only mean for Mexico what it did for Russia, even if Germany had won; and they see Mexico's future in friendship with us.

If we would permit it, if we would recognize the facts from the world-standpoint, that assumed diplomatic regularity is being used intentionally to hold us off and for no other purpose, as Germany hoped to do first with England and then with us, till the better time; if we would recognize the Mexican people whose welfare we have at heart, instead of the Carranza Government which has betrayed the Mexican Revolution as Lenine did the Russian; if we would only go no further than was done by the Carranza Government itself in the letters above, and recognize the belligerency of the legitimate State Government of Oaxaca, the whole matter would be settled by an immediate declaration of alliance by that Sovereignty, carrying with it all the rest of the Revolutionary movement through the whole Republic. We would lose Carranza, and with him the danger which he and the German Minister are fomenting, that we be drawn into attacking *Mexico* on the northern border, or in Tampico; all danger of the rupture between us and the Mexicans would cease, for the Carranza Government could not last if the Revolutionists got the ammunition they need.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The interior condition is wholly misunderstood in this country. It is not a case of more or less widespread banditry, pillage. It is a political movement, it is unified, and all the parties are in communication and coöperation, slowly strengthening themselves and pinching in the Carranza Government amidst the growing hatred of the whole people, and its economically critical situation.

The present movement is a unified political revolution to restore constitutional government, wipe out the socialistic legislation, and come back to a position of respect internationally. From a military point, the country is controlled by three main forces, in coöperation: Félix Díaz commanding in Chiapas, Vera Cruz, the Tehuantepec isthmus, and part of Puebla; the Oaxaca State forces under Meixueiro; Zapata commanding in Morelos, part of Puebla and Guerrero; Guerrero also seceded lately, and State forces there coöperate; up the west side and through the north various military leaders; on the east coast in the oil district, Peláez. The southern contingents have definite political programmes (substantially identical) to the restoration of constitutional government, with reforms giving effect to the social principles underlying the late revolution; these programmes have been accepted by the military chiefs in the north. And they include for the first time in Mexico's history the economic regeneration of the Indian; that is Zapata's one care, for which he will fight to the end; it is Meixueiro's; and Díaz has made it his. The Mexican revolution (really started by Zapata in 1909, before Madero) will never end until the mountain peasants of Morelos come into their own; you might as well fight the Swiss; but give them their farms, buying them from the landlords if necessary, and it ends to-morrow. And above all give them economic assurance *that it is worth while saving*—and their regeneration and that of Mexico will come.

What is our part? Recognize the facts, and not just the theories of the case. The Carranza-von Eckhardt Government of Mexico, and the Alvarado-I. W. W. Government of Yucatan know that we really understand the situation; but they hope that we can be kept edging on until they have made our final action too late.

William Gates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL WE ACCEPT THE UNIVERSE?

BY JOHN BURROUGHS

I

It was reported of Margaret Fuller that she said she accepted the universe. "By Gad, she'd better!" retorted Carlyle. Carlyle himself seemed to accept the universe with many misgivings. Looking up at the midnight skies he said, "A sad spectacle! If they be inhabited, what a scope for pain and folly, and if they be na' inhabited, what a waste of space." It should not be a hard thing to accept the universe since we have no choice in the matter; but I have found it worth while to look the gift-horse in the mouth, and convince myself that it is really worth accepting. It were a pity to go through life with a suspicion in one's mind that it might have been a better universe, and that some wrong has been done us because we have no freedom of choice in the matter. The thought would add a tinge of bitterness to all our days. And so, after living more than eighty-one years in the world and pondering long and intently upon the many problems which life and nature present, I have come, like Margaret Fuller, to accept the universe, have come frankly to approve that first verdict pronounced upon creation, namely, that it is very good,—good in its sum total up to this astronomic date, whatever phases it may at times present that lead us to a contrary conclusion.

Not that cold and hunger, war and pestilence, tornadoes and earthquakes, are good in a positive sense, but that these and kindred things are vastly overbalanced by the forces and agencies that make for our well-being—that "work together for good"—the sunshine, the cooling breezes, the fertile soil, the stability of the land and sea, the gentle currents, the equipoise of the forces of the earth, air, and water, the order and security of our solar system, and, in the human realm, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

good-will and fellowship that are finally bound to prevail among men and nations.

In remote geologic ages, before the advent of man, when the earth's crust was less stable, when the air was yet loaded with poisonous gases, when terrible and monstrous animal forms held high carnival in the sea and upon the land, it was not in the same sense good,—good for beings constructed as we are now. In future astronomic time, when the earth's air and water and warmth shall have disappeared—a time which science predicts—and all life upon the globe fails, again it will not be good. But in our geologic, biologic, and astronomic age, notwithstanding the fact that cold and suffering, war and pestilence, cyclones and earthquakes, still occur upon the relatively tiny ball that carries us through the vast siderial spaces, the good is greatly in the ascendency. The voyage is not all calm and sunshine, but it is safe, and the dangers from collision and shipwreck are very remote. It is a vast and lonely sea over which we are journeying, no other ships hail us and bid us god-speed, no messages, wireless or other, may reach us from other shores, or other seas; forces and influences do play upon us from all parts of the empyrean, but, so far as we are aware, no living thing on other spheres takes note of our going or our coming.

In our practical lives we are compelled to separate good from evil—the one being that which favors our well-being, and the other that which antagonizes it—but, viewed as a whole, the universe is all good; it is an infinite complex of compensations out of which worlds and systems of worlds, and all which they hold, have emerged, and are emerging, and will emerge. This is not the language of the heart or of the emotions—our anthropomorphism cries out against it—but it is the language of serene, impartial reason. It is good for us occasionally to get outside the sphere of our personal life and view things as they are in and of themselves. A great demand is made upon our faith—faith in the absolute trustworthiness of the human reason, and in the final beneficence of the forces that rule this universe. Not to solve the mysteries, but to see that they are insoluble, and to rest content in that conclusion, is the task we set ourselves here.

Evidently the tide of life is still at the flood on this planet; its checks and counter currents arise inevitably in a universe whose forces are always, and always must be, in unstable equilibrium.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The love of the Eternal for mankind, and for all other forms of life, is not a parental love—not the love of the mother for her child, or of the father for his son—it is more like the love which a general has for his army; he is to lead that army through hardships, through struggles, through sufferings, and through death, but he is leading it to victory. Many will perish that others may live; the battle is being won daily. Evolution has triumphed. It has been a long and desperate battle, but here we are and we find life sweet. The antagonistic forces which have been overcome have become sources of power. The vast army of living forms moving down the geologic ages has been made strong through the trials and obstacles it has surmounted, till now we behold it in the fulness of its power with man at its head.

II

There is a paragraph in Emerson's Journal on Providence, written when he was twenty-one, which is as broad and as wise and as heterodox as anything he ever wrote. The Providence he depicts is the Providence I see in Nature:

"Providence supports but does not spoil its children. We are called sons, not darlings, of the Deity. There is ever good in store for those who love it, knowledge for those who seek it, and if we do evil we suffer the consequences of evil. Throughout the administration of the world there is the same aspect of stern kindness; of good against your will; good against your good; ten thousand channels of active beneficence, but all flowing with the same regard to general, not particular profit.

"And to such an extent is this great statute policy of God carried that many, nay most, of the great blessings of humanity require cycles of a thousand years to bring them to light."

A remarkable statement to be made in 1824, in New England, and by a fledgling preacher of the orthodox faith, and the descendant of a long line of orthodox clergymen. It is as broad and as impartial as science, and yet makes a strong imaginative appeal. Good at the heart of Nature is the purport of it, not the patent right good of the creeds, but good, free to all who love it, a "stern kindness," and no partial, personal, vacillating Providence whose ear is open only to the password of some sect or cult, or organization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Good against your good," your copyrighted good, your personal, selfish good (unless it is in line with equal good to others)—the broad, universal beneficence of Nature which brought us here and keeps us here, and showers its good upon us as long as we keep in right relations with it; but which goes its appointed way regardless of the sore needs of warring nations or the desperate straits of struggling men. That is the Providence that lasts, that does not change its mind, that is not indulgent, that does not take sides, that is without variableness or shadow of turning. Suppose the law of gravity were changeable, or the law of chemical reactions, or the nature of fire, or air, or water, or cohesion? Gravity never sleeps or varies, yet see bodies rise, see others fall, see the strong master of the weak, see the waters flow and the ground stay; the laws of fluids are fixed, but see the variety of their behavior, the forms in which they crystallize, their solvent power, their stability or instability, their capacity to absorb or conduct heat—flux and change everywhere amid fixity and law, nature is infinitely variable, which opens the door to all forms of life; her goings and comings are on such a large scale, like the rains, the dews, the sunlight, that all creatures get an equal benefit. She sows her seed with such a generous hand that the mass of them are bound to fall upon fertile places. Such as are very limited in range, like those of the swamp plants, are yet cast forth upon the wind so liberally that sooner or later some of them fall upon conditions suitable to them. Nature will cover a whole township with her wind-sown seeds in order to be sure that she hits the small swamp in one corner of it.

A stream of energy, not described by the adjective inexhaustible, bears the universe along, and all forms of life, man with the rest, take their chances amid its currents and its maelstroms. The good providence shows itself in the power of adaptation all forms of life possess. Some forms of sea weed or sea grass grow where the waves pound the shore incessantly. How many frail marine creatures are wrecked upon the shore, but how many more are not wrecked! How many ships go down in the sea, but how many more are wafted safely over it!

The Providence in nature seems intent only on playing the game, irrespective of the stakes, which to us seem so important. Whatever the issue, Nature is the winner. She cannot lose. Her beneficence is wholesale. Her myriad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forms of life are constantly passing through " the curtain of fire " of her inorganic forces, and the casualties are great, but the majority get through. The assault goes on and will ever go on. It is like a stream of water that is whole and individual at every point, but fixed and stable at no point. To play the game, to keep the currents going—from the depths of siderial space to the shallow pool by the road side; from the rise and fall of nations, to the brief hour of the minute summer insects, the one over-arching purpose seems to be to give free rein to life, to play one form against another, to build up and tear down, to gather together and to scatter—no rest, no end, nothing final—rocks decaying to build more rocks, worlds destroyed to build more worlds, nations disintegrating to build more nations, organisms perishing to feed more organisms, life playing into the hands of death everywhere, and death playing into the hands of life, sea and land interchanging, tropic and arctic meeting and mingling, day and night, winter and summer chasing each other over the earth—what a spectacle of change, what a drama never completed! Vast worlds and systems in fiery flux, one little corner of the cosmos teeming with life, vast areas of it, like Saturn and Jupiter, dead and barren through untold millions of years; collisions and disruptions in the heavens, tornadoes and earthquake and wars and pestilence upon the earth—surely it all sounds worse than it is, for we are all here to see and contemplate the great spectacle—sounds worse than it is to us because we are a part of the outcome of all these raging and conflicting forces. Whatever has failed, we have succeeded, and the beneficent forces are still coming our way.

The greatest of human achievements and the most precious is that of the great creative artist. In words, in color, in sounds, in forms, man comes nearest to emulating the Creative Energy itself. Nature is the art of God, as Sir Thomas Browne said. It seems as if the pleasure and the purpose of the Creative Energy was endless invention, to strike out new forms, to vary perpetually the pattern. Myriads of forms, myriads of types, inexhaustible variety in air, earth, water, ten thousand ways to achieve the same end, a prodigality of means that bewilders the mind; to produce something new and different, an endless variety of forms that fly, that swim, that creep, in the sea, in the air, on the earth, in the fields, in the woods, on the shore. How many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ways Nature has of scattering her seeds, how many types of wings, of hooks, of springs! In some she offers a wage to bird or quadruped in the shape of fruit, others she forcibly attaches to the passer-by. In all times and places there is a riot of invention.

III

Are we not men enough to face things as they are? Must we be cosseted a little? Can we not be weaned from the old theological pap? Can we not rest content in the general beneficence of Nature's Providence? Must you and I have a special hold upon the Great Mother's apron strings?

I see the Nature Providence going its impartial way. I see drought and flood, heat and cold, war and pestilence, defeat and death, besetting man at all times, in all lands. I see hostile germs in the air he breathes, in the water he drinks, in the soil he tills. I see the elemental forces as indifferent toward him as toward ants and fleas. I see pain and disease and defeat and failure dogging his footsteps. I see the righteous defeated and the ungodly triumphant—this and much more I see, and yet I behold through the immense biological vista behind us the race of man slowly—oh, so slowly!—emerging from its brute or semi-human ancestry into the full estate of man, from blind instinct and savage passion into the light of reason and moral consciousness. I behold the great scheme of evolution unfolding despite all the delays and waste and failures, and the higher forms appearing upon the scene. I see on an immense scale, and as clearly as in a demonstration in an experimental laboratory, that good comes out of evil, that the impartiality of the Nature Providence is best, that we are made strong by what we overcome, that man is man because he is as free to do evil as to do good, that life is as free to develop hostile forms as to develop friendly, that power waits upon him who earns it, that disease, wars, the unloosened, devastating elemental forces, have each and all played their part in developing and hardening man and giving him the heroic fibre. The good would have no tang, no edge, no cutting quality without evil to oppose it. Life would be tasteless or insipid, without pain and struggle and disappointment. Behold what the fiery furnace does for the metals—welding or blending or separating or purifying them, and behold the hell of contending and destructive forces out of which the earth came, and again

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

behold the grinding and eroding forces, the storms and earthquakes and eruptions, and disintegrations that have made it the green inhabitable world that now sustains us. No, the universal processes do not need disinfecting, the laws of the winds, the rains, the sunlight do not need rectifying. "I do not want the constellations any nearer," says Whitman. I do not want the natural Providence any more attentive. The celestial laws are here underfoot and our treading upon them does not obliterate or vulgarize them. Chemistry is incorruptible and immortal, it is the handmaid of God; the yeast works in the elements of our bread of life while we sleep; the stars send their influences, the earth renews itself, the brooding heavens gathers us under its wings, and all is well with us if we have the heroic hearts to see it.

In the curve of the moon's or of the planets' disks, all broken or irregular lines of the surface are lost to the eye—the wholeness of the sphere form subordinates and obliterates them all—so all the failures and cross purposes and disharmonies in nature and life do not suffice to break or mar the vast general beneficence; the flowing universal good is obvious above all.

So long as we think of the Eternal in terms of our experience of the knowledge of concrete things and beings which life discloses to us, we are involved in contradictions. The ancients visualized their gods and goddesses, Jove, Apollo, Minerva, Juno, and all the others. Shall we do this for the Eternal and endow it with personality? Into what absurdities it leads us! The unspeakable, the unseeable, the unthinkable, the inscrutable, and yet the most obvious fact that life yields to us! Nearer and more vital than our own bodies, than our own parents, and yet eluding our grasp; vehemently denied, passionately accepted, scoffed, praised, feared, worshipped, giving rise to deism, atheism, pantheism, to idolatry, to persecution, to martyrdom, the great Reality in which we live and move and have our being, and yet for that very reason, because it is a part of us, or rather we are a part of it, are we unable to define it or seize it as a reality apart from ourselves. Our denial proves it; just as we use gravity to overcome gravity, so we use God to deny God. Just as pure light is of no color, but split up makes all the colors that we see, so God divided and reflected makes all the half gods we worship in life. Green and blue and red and orange are not in the objects that reflect them, but are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an experience of the eye. We might with our tongues deny the air, but our spoken words prove it. We cannot lift ourselves over the fence by our own waist-bands, no more can we by searching find God, because He is not an object that has place and form and limitations; He is the fact of the fact, the life of the life, the soul of the soul, the incomprehensible, the sum of all contradictions, the unit of all diversity; he who knows Him, knows Him not, he who is without Him, is full of Him; turn your back upon Him, then turn your back upon gravity, upon air, upon light. He cannot be seen, but by Him all seeing comes, He cannot be heard, yet by Him all hearing comes; He is not a being, yet apart *from Him there is no being—there is no apart from Him.* We contradict ourselves when we deny Him; it is ourselves we deny, and equally do we contradict ourselves when we accept Him; it is something apart from ourselves which we accept.

When half-gods go, says Emerson, the gods arrive. But half-gods never go; we can house and entertain no other. What can we do with the Infinity, the Eternal? We can only deal with things in time and space—things that can be numbered and measured. What can we do with the infinitely little, the infinitely great? All our gods are half-gods made in our own image. No surer does the wax take the imprint of the seal than does the Infinite take the imprint of our finite minds. We create a Creator, we rule a Ruler, we invent a heaven and hell; they are laws of our own being, seen externally.

How, then, shall we adjust our lives to the conception of a universal, non-human, non-finite algebraic God? They adjust themselves. Do your work, deal justly, love rightness, make the most of yourself, cherish the good, the beautiful, the true, practice the Christian and the heathen virtues of soberness, meekness, reverence, charity, unselfishness, justice, mercy, singleness of purpose—obey the commandments, the Golden Rule, imbue your spirit with the wisdom of all ages, for thus is the moral order of the world upheld.

The moral order and the intellectual order go hand in hand. Upon one rests our relations to our fellows, upon the other rests our relation to the Cosmos.

We must know, and we must love, we must do, and we must enjoy, we must warm judgment with feeling, and illume conscience with reason.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Admit, if we must, that we are in the grip of a merciless power—that outside of our own kind there is nothing that shows us mercy or consideration—that the Nature of which we form a part goes her own way regardless of us, yet let us keep in mind that the very fact that we are here and find life good is proof that the mercilessness of Nature has not been inconsistent with our permanent well-being. The fact that flowers bloom and fruit and grains ripen, that the sun shines, that the rain falls, that food nourishes us, that love warms us, that evolution has brought us thus far on our way, that our line of descent has survived all the hazards of the geologic ages—all point to the fact that we are on the winning side, that our well-being is secured in the constitution of things. For all the cataclysms and disruptions, the globe has ripened on the great siderial tree, and has become the fit abode of its myriad forms of life. Though we may be run down and crushed by the great terrestrial forces about us, just as we may be run down and crushed in the street, yet these forces play a part in the activities that sustain us; without them we should not be here to suffer at their hands.

Our life depends from moment to moment upon the air we breathe, yet its winds and tempests may destroy us; it depends from day to day upon the water we drink, yet its floods may sweep us away. We walk and climb and work and move mountains by gravity, and yet gravity may break every bone in our bodies. We spread our sails to the wind and they become our faithful servitors, yet the winds may drive us into the jaws of the breakers. How are our lives bound up and identified with the merciless forces that surround us! Out of the heart of fate comes our freedom; out of the reign of death comes our life; out of the sea of impersonal energy come our personalities; out of the rocks comes the soil that sustains us; out of the fiery nebulae came the earth with its apple blossoms and its murmuring streams; out of the earth came man. If the cosmic forces were not merciless, if they did not go their own way, if they made exceptions for you and me, if in them there *were* variableness and even a shadow of turning, the vast inevitable beneficence of Nature would vanish, and the caprice and uncertainty of man take its place. If the sun were to stand still for Joshua to conquer his enemies, there would be no further need for it to resume its journey. What I am trying to get rid of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the pitying and meddling Providence which our feeble faith and half-knowledge have enthroned above us. We need stronger meat than the old theology affords us. We need to contemplate the ways of a Providence that has not been subsidized; we need encouragement in our attitude of heroic courage and faith toward an impersonal universe; we need to have our petty anthropomorphic views of things shaken up and hung out in the wind to air. The universe is not a school-room on the Montessori system, nor a benevolent institution run on the most modern improved plan. It is a work-a-day field where we learn from hard knocks, and where the harvest, not too sure, waits upon our own right arm.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND AND THE SEA

BY DAVID MORTON

These are great lovers: one a jewelled queen
In whom unalterably the white flame burns;
And one a moody changeling, gray and green,
Savage and tender, cruel and kind by turns.
With what a gift of tall and stately ships,
With what sweet promise that was rich and good,
Has England wooed those bright and bitter lips,
Counting the cost but as a lover should.

I have known men who loved the craggy peaks
That brothered them with stars and made them wise,
And men who loved a valley and its creeks,
Or plains more fair than woman to their eyes;
Yet had I never known such love could be
As this, where England gazes on the sea.

I TOO HAVE LOVED

FLORENCE EARLE COATES

I, too, have loved the Greeks, the Hero-sprung,
The glad, spoiled children of Posterity:
Have closed my eyes, more near their shrines to be,
Have hushed my heart, to hear their epics sung.
Upon their golden accents I have hung,
With Thyrsis wooed to vales of Sicily,
And Homer, blind, has given me to see
Olympus, where the deathless Gods were young.

But still, that one remembering with awe
Whose vision deeper than all others saw,
I feel the dearer debt my spirit owes
To him, who towers, peerless and sublime,
The noblest, largest intellect of Time,
Born where the English Avon softly flows.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOS

BY EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON

I

All you that are enamored of my name
And least intent on what most I require,
Beware; for my design and your desire,
Deplorably, are not as yet the same.
Beware, I say, the failure and the shame
Of losing that for which you now aspire
So blindly, and of hazarding entire
The gift that I was bringing when I came.

Give as I will, I cannot give you sight
Whereby to see that with you there are some
To lead you, and be led. But they are dumb
Before the wrangling and the shrill delight
Of your deliverance that has not come,
And shall not, if I fail you—as I might.

II

So little have you seen of what awaits
Your fevered glimpse of a democracy
Confused and foiled with an equality
Not equal to the envy it creates,
That you see not how near you are the gates
Of an old king who listens fearfully
To you that are outside and are to be
The noisy lords of imminent estates.

Rather be then your prayer for what you have
Than what your power denies you, having all.
See not the great among you for the small,
But hear their silence; for the few shall save
The many, or the many are to fall—
Still to be wrangling in a noisy grave.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS GREAT LITERATURE INTELLIGIBLE?

BY HARRY T. BAKER

MOST periodicals are conducted on the principle that all of their contents shall be intelligible to the average reader. Naturally, this excludes a good deal of important matter. Indeed, it excludes some of the greatest literature of any period; for great authors, including Kipling in the present generation, expect the reader to possess sufficient imagination, intelligence, and sympathy to meet them on their own level. As Ruskin put it, in *Sesame and Lilies,* we must make ourselves worthy of the kingdom of literature in order to be free of it. We must not ask ourselves, Does the writer agree with me? but, How can I make myself fit to understand his words and to heed them? No vile or vulgar person, added Ruskin, can enter the kingdom. The object of great writers is not wholly to please. In fact, in the case of Ruskin himself, and of Carlyle and Swift, it was to denounce and to warn. And all three are to some degree and in some passages or whole works—for example, Swift's social satire, *A Modest Proposal*—unintelligible to stupidly conventional people. The fault lies with the reader, however. He must make himself worthy to understand. To this end, he needs the guidance of a teacher. No doubt, there is plenty of bad teaching, where the blind leads the blind. None the less, the best literature must be taught if it is to be apprehended; and our best schools and colleges justify themselves by their fruits. A literary background, often supplemented by specific instruction, is necessary to the complete understanding and enjoyment of literature.

Gulliver's Travels, for example, is interesting to children; but even the average adult often misses its best and most penetrating social satire. He may miss the ridicule of pedantry in the conduct and beliefs of the philosophers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lagado, in the third book, or the profound satire on the fear of death in the description of the revolting prolongation of the natural threescore years and ten in the case of the immortals or Struldbrugs, who are detested by all normal people in their country. Still less may the average reader understand the contrast, by implication, between Swift's ideal race, the Houyhnhnms, and ordinary human beings. Even men who were themselves authors of note, like Thackeray, have failed to perceive that Swift, far from being a monster, was an unwavering idealist; that his vision of human perfectibility in the fourth book of *Gulliver* is one of the most inspiring as well as one of the wisest ever penned. Swift is one of the best of authors by whom to gauge the intellectual limitations of a reader. And, since *Gulliver* is one of the half dozen really great works of prose in the English language, it is important that as many of us as possible should be brought to a fuller comprehension of the wisdom and literary genius of Swift. Addison and Steele yield themselves much more readily to the superficial student; but neither was so great a thinker or so great a genius as Swift. Their literary riches are more easily accessible—and correspondingly less valuable. Swift knew how to write plainly—witness his *Drapier's Letters* and his other political pamphlets—but his more profound speculations in *Gulliver* and the *Tale of a Tub* require more of the reader.

No one can understand Ruskin, in *The Crown of Wild Olive* or *Unto This Last,* without ascertaining that he was a passionate lover of beauty and a hater of materialism and of all forms of social injustice. He detested railroads in beautiful valleys because they destroyed much of the beauty of the scenery; he hated the factory system and the introduction of machinery because they made labor mechanical and unenjoyable. Ruskin, being destitute of a sense of humor, was often unreasonable in his demands; but he was always eloquent, and always a master of that wonderful stringed instrument, English prose. What a stroke of genius, both in thought and expression, is his enumeration of the qualities, in *Unto This Last,* whereby one becomes rich or poor. It has to a remarkable degree that vital literary characteristic, power of suggestion:

> In a community regulated only by laws of demand and supply, but protected from open violence, the persons who become rich are, generally speaking, industrious, resolute, proud, covetous, prompt,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

methodical, sensible, unimaginative, insensitive, and ignorant. The persons who remain poor are the entirely foolish, the entirely wise, the idle, the reckless, the humble, the thoughtful, the dull, the imaginative, the sensitive, the well-informed, the improvident, the irregularly and impulsively wicked, the clumsy knave, the open thief, and the entirely merciful, just, and godly person.

Superficial and prejudiced observers have set Ruskin down as a mere fanatic or a hysterical babbler; he was considered also, after *Modern Painters*, a "fine writer," which meant, he indignantly declared, "that no one need mind what I say." In reality, as Mr. J. A. Hobson has shown us in his wise volume, Ruskin was a singularly acute and profound social reformer; and one of his chief "faults" was that he was half a century, and in some views a whole century, ahead of his period. We are just catching up with Ruskin. He needs less explanation now than in his own time; but he is still too rapid and imaginative in the evolution of his thought for minds occupied with commercial problems or minds naturally dull. It is a misfortune, however, to fail to understand John Ruskin. It is not remarkable, but pitiable, that the publication of *Unto This Last* in the *Cornhill Magazine* about 1860 should have resulted in almost universal condemnation. Thackeray, who was then editing the magazine, wrote after the appearance of three instalments that the papers were so widely disliked that he could admit but one more. Carlyle, who, it will be remembered, thought England populated mostly by fools, pronounced a wise and favorable verdict which later criticism has for the most part confirmed: "Not one doctrine that I can intrinsically dissent from or count other than salutary in the extreme, and pressingly needed in England above all." Carlyle against the multitude is enough.

The most profitable method of studying literature is by periods: Ruskin, Carlyle, Arnold, Browning, Tennyson together; Swift, Addison, Steele, Defoe, Pope together; Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher together. This implies study of the social, political, religious movements of these periods, the ideas in common and the ideas in contrast which these writers held, the spirit and atmosphere of each period, its attitude to reason versus emotion, to romance, to natural science, to commerce—especially in America at the present time. Each new author is a new problem, too. The rules of literary success cannot, except within narrow limits, be codified. Hence the young Kipling

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

requires fresh eyes for right appraisal; it will not do to look through the misty spectacles of the past. All this means exercise of a reader's brain, exercise of his power of sympathy and adaptation, a test of his openness of mind. Only a minority of magazine readers can meet successfully such a variety of tests; and therefore the canny editor regretfully denies them some of the highest flights of literary genius. It is unfortunate, but it is so. Anything that runs sharply counter to received opinion is dangerous magazine material. Even a great name is not always sufficient to calm the ruffled sensibilities of commonplace subscribers. The question of familiarity with a former literary period does not enter here—though it might induce a proper humility. The advice of little tinkling Tom Moore, for example, to Byron to "beware of Shelley's skeptical opinions" sounds humorous today; for in the moral scale Shelley is now rated somewhat higher than the noble lord. Misunderstood and persecuted in his own generation, he is at last recognized as at least much more unselfish and more devoted to the good of humanity than Byron. Some great literature, some great men, are in the nature of things partly or temporarily unintelligible.

Culture, then, involves a willingness to learn, not merely a demand to be pleased. It is a growing and a becoming; it is, as its great apostle, Arnold, pointed out, a familiarity with "the best that is known and thought in the world." An enjoyment of even the most humorous essays of Lamb implies a background of culture; and Arnold himself suavely takes for granted a complete devotion to Homer and the other chief glories of ancient classical civilization! In an age of vocational training and colleges of commerce, this is an almost insulting assumption to some of our "best people." Shakespeare, too, though not himself a university man, absorbed much of this classical culture and evidently thought it valuable. Keats ramped through Lemprière's classical dictionary, says one of his biographers, like a colt at pasture. And Browning, Kipling, and others have voyaged through strange seas of thought in an English dictionary, merely to discover new riches of their own tongue. With resources so much greater than those of the commonplace reader, then, is it at all wonderful that they should at times be "unintelligible"? There is no royal road to the understanding and appreciation of the best literature; one must prepare and always prepare. "The readiness is all."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shakespeare, who shows so much, shows several separate elements of appeal which warrant the optimistic statement that even the commonplace reader or hearer can get enough to make him appreciative. There are skilfully elaborated plot, entirely natural and complete character delineation, a wise and tolerant philosophy of life, an indescribable deftness of phrase—" the white wonder of dear Juliet's hand "—and a perfect adaptation to the stage, to immediate effect on an average audience. Shakespeare's plays, it cannot be too often repeated, were written to be acted, not to be read. Academic critics have been long in assenting to this cardinal principle; but Shakespeare has little in common with academic persons. No writer was less a pedant.

How much does the casual theater-goer understand of *Hamlet?* Certainly not the mystic's attitude to life, nor more than half the reasons for Hamlet's so often postponed revenge. Shakespeare is much more obscure here than usual; but the obscurity is due to the subject. Hamlet has a profound and an unusual intellect, compounded of many simples. He is in a morbid state—he assures us of that himself—but he is not insane. In fact, as Lowell pointed out, to make him insane would be unthinkable, for we should then have a tragedy with an irresponsible hero; and Shakespeare knew long before this how to construct a tragedy. Hamlet loves Ophelia, but gives her up because her timid and conventional nature can be of no service to him in his great task of avenging his father. He detests Polonius because Polonius is a bore,—commonplace, garrulous, full of wise saws but with no ideas of his own. Not all of these things can be grasped by the average reader or playgoer, yet he can grasp enough to fascinate him; and a second or third reading or attendance at the theater will bring him new riches. Indeed, the most useful single test of the distinction between mediocre literature and great literature is that of ascertaining whether one's appreciation of any piece of writing is enhanced or diminished upon rereading. Not even the most intelligent reader can exhaust Shakespeare at a first perusal; but he can exhaust a modern detective story thus; for, the mystery once unraveled, there is little else to ponder over. Shakespeare leaves that impression of infinity which is possible only to the greatest artists. In the realm of wit, Falstaff—the Falstaff of the two parts of *Henry IV*, not of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*—leaves the same impression of the inexhaustible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The casual reader, however, will fail to perceive what Professor A. C. Bradley has affirmed: that Shakespeare created in Falstaff so extraordinarily attractive a figure that when he wished to get rid of him, upon the crowning of Prince Hal, he could not do so without displeasing the audience. We do not readily forgive Henry's treatment of his old companion. Falstaff may have had within him an intolerable deal of sack, but he also had much more of the milk of human kindness than the cold-hearted and calculating young monarch. Professor Bradley's analysis of this problem makes us realize that in Shakespeare there is frequently much more than meets the eye. His essay, by the way, reprinted in *Oxford Studies in Poetry,* was originally published under the title, *The Rejection of Falstaff,* in the *Fortnightly Review,* a periodical which has done much to further the cause of literature.

Poetry is in general more difficult of comprehension and of full appreciation than is prose. It requires more imagination, more idealism, more acquaintance with the subtleties of melody and movement, and with condensed and heightened phrase. College girls are more acute than college boys in fathoming the mysteries of verse; the boys, especially in our democratic State universities, are too materialistic; their spirits are dragged away only with difficulty from the too, too solid flesh of this world. Poetry moves in a diviner air. Among the evils which would have come upon a Prussianized globe would have been the diminution of great poetry; for it has nothing in common with triumphant materialism and the worship of the goddess Espionage. American commercialism, too, is hostile to the muses. Philistinism, the devotion of all one's energies to money-making and to the grossly material things of life, is, like materialistic science, the very opposite of a poetic attitude. It was Coleridge who declared that the opposite of poetry is not prose, but science. Not all modern science, however, is materialistic; and Kipling, in *M'Andrew's Hymn,* has sung the song of steam. His exquisite prose poem, the short story *They* (in *Traffics and Discoveries*) even introduces some technical chat about a motor car. Yet what poetry there is in his phrase anent the joy of motion in this modern machine: "I let the county flow under my wheels."

It must not be supposed, however, that poetry is a mere glorification of form, of apt expression. All great poetry is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wise; it is what Arnold called a "criticism of life." When Keats said that beauty is truth, truth beauty, he uttered a great idea: that what the artist creates (beauty) is as true as real life. Shakespeare's creations of the imagination—Hamlet, Lady Macbeth, Imogen, Cordelia, Antony—are as real as the man who walks down the street. The struggles of young thinkers over religious problems, in the Victorian era, are best portrayed and discussed in poetry, the poetry of Arnold, Tennyson (particularly *In Memoriam*) and Browning. *Rabbi Ben Ezra* is the best statement, in condensed form, of triumphant religious faith that we have in literature. It is alone enough to justify poetry as a criticism of life. This poem presents, however, difficulties of expression due to its very effort at condensation. Browning was too prone to believe that his reader could follow all of his short-cut expressions. As one of his critics says, he climbed a ladder from one idea to another and then kicked away the ladder. The reader is therefore put to some trouble to replace it. In the first of the following stanzas, the difficulty is due chiefly to the postponement of the verb to the second stanza:

> Not that, amassing flowers,
> Youth sighed, "Which rose make ours,
> "Which lily leave and then as best recall?"
> Not that, admiring stars,
> It yearned, "Nor Jove nor Mars;
> "Mine be some figured flame which blends, transcends them all!"
>
> Not for such hopes and fears
> Annulling youth's brief years,
> Do I remonstrate: folly wide the mark!

In the final line there is the additional difficulty of the omission of a verb: "That would be folly wide of the mark." This brief, pregnant fashion of phrasing, this crowding of language, grew upon Shakespeare also in his later plays. *Antony and Cleopatra* is full at once of felicities and puzzles, some of them "as indistinct as water is in water."

Yet who would have it otherwise? Poetic magic escapes, in any attempt to paraphrase it. It can be stated only in its own words. As excellent critics have declared with heat, no school exercise is so futile as that of "explaining" poetry in a prose paraphrase. There is no equivalence; for no two specimens of form are equivalent. What began as poetry ends as mere pedantry. The thought and the form in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is couched cannot be discussed separately; they fuse in the heat of composition and, like the Liberty and Union of Webster's great speech, become one and inseparable. Some tripping meters are obviously adapted, too, to light or humorous subjects; blank verse, to serious and dignified ones. Shakespeare wrote nearly all of his humorous scenes in prose; and sometimes he mixed prose and verse in the same scene. As Professor C. T. Winchester points out in his *Principles of Literary Criticism*,[1] there is a ludicrous failure to adapt meter to theme in the following stanza of a hymn, where solemn thought is conveyed in a music-hall jingle:

> How tedious and tasteless the hours
> When Jesus no longer I see.
> Sweet prospects, sweet birds, and sweet flowers
> Have all lost their sweetness to me.

It is a movement, says Professor Winchester, "which suggests Sir Toby's resolve to 'go to church in a galliard and come home in a coranto'."

The sonorous opening of Lincoln's *Gettysburg Speech*, "Fourscore and seven years ago," is not equivalent to eighty-seven years ago! Prose hath her harmonies, no less than poetry. It is such subtleties that make up the full effect of literary expression. "Victuals" is not equivalent to "food"; "deathlessness" is not the same as "immortality"—as Lowell showed when he suggested that we try converting Wordsworth's title, *Intimations of Immortality*, into *Hints of Deathlessness*. Wordsworth, however, does not reveal so many difficulties as Browning or Shakespeare. His difficulty, to a reader of his own time, lay chiefly in the novelty of his attitude to nature, an attitude now so largely adopted by other writers as to be intelligible to the multitude. His doctrine of the Divine Immanence, the presence of God in His world, is perhaps the most important single contribution to modern theology. The quotation in which it first occurs, from *Tintern Abbey*, is so hackneyed as to need no repetition. But Wordsworth, like so many other great men, was so far in advance of his age that until 1830 (and the *Lyrical Ballads*, containing *Tintern Abbey*, were published in 1798) he achieved little popularity. Hazlitt, that penetrating and enthusiastic critic, was one of the first to discover and proclaim him to a reluctant public. The hyperbole of this state-

[1] Page 255.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, from one of Wordsworth's early poems, *The Tables Turned,* may well have given pause to a Philistine of 1798:

> One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of moral evil and of good,
> Than all the sages can.

But the simplicity of expression is all that could be desired; and this simplicity is characteristic of most of Wordsworth's best work—the work of those short ten years to 1808 beyond which the flame of his genius seemed quickly to dwindle and flicker. One of the few consolations of growing old, however, is that forty and sixty always appreciate the poetry of Wordsworth more than twenty. The obvious brilliancies of Byron are almost always more engaging to youth than the grave meditativeness of him who knew the presences of the hills and the impressive unity of all nature—which he has recorded in those wonderful lines, full of Miltonic organ music and Miltonic grandeur of style:

> The immeasurable height
> Of woods decaying, never to be decayed,
> The stationary blasts of waterfalls,
> And in the narrow rent, at every turn,
> Winds thwarting winds bewildered and forlorn,
> The torrents shooting from the clear blue sky,
> The rocks that muttered close upon our ears,
> Black drizzling crags that spake by the wayside
> As if a voice were in them, the sick sight
> And giddy prospect of the raving stream
> The unfettered clouds and region of the heavens,
> Tumult and peace, the darkness and the light—
> Were all like workings of one mind, the features
> Of the same face, blossoms upon one tree,
> Characters of the great Apocalypse,
> The types and symbols of Eternity,
> Of first, and last, and midst, and without end.

The Simplon Pass, which gives these lines their title, was never so described before.

Wordsworth is one of the best illustrations of the principle that no great literature is intelligible until the reader asks himself these two questions: What was this author trying to do? Has he done it successfully? One can never substitute with profit the question, What ought he to have been trying to do? The reader must first give himself up as a disciple—which does not imply, however, a surrender of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the functions of criticism. Jeffrey was ridiculous because he thought himself competent to direct Wordsworth's purposes as a poet. He failed to comprehend the nature poems because he constantly substituted his own attitude to nature for Wordsworth's. The combination of realism and romanticism, too, in Wordsworth's best work, such as *The Leech-Gatherer* (later entitled *Resolution and Independence*) puzzled the Caledonian understanding of this self-appointed Jove. Yet Shakespeare had already done something similar, on a larger scale, in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. The influence of nature, both through immediate experience and through memory, upon human character is another somewhat difficult element in Wordsworth. It is referred to in *Tintern Abbey* and repeated in various later poems. Doubtless this influence was much greater upon the author himself than upon even the most modern reader; but there was no reason why it should have been either misunderstood or ridiculed—no reason save the commonplaceness of ordinary human nature. The successful editor never loses sight of this commonplaceness. His chief problem is to remain conscious of it and still be an optimist.

Perhaps Wordsworth, like most great authors, often dealt with what we call the supernatural. This is a frequent and fruitful source of difficulty to the average reader. Poe dealt with it continually, and chiefly with its horrifying side. Kipling, in his later period, has shown a fondness for it: in *The Brushwood Boy, They, Wireless, The Dog Hervey, Swept and Garnished.* The last two are in his volume, *A Diversity of Creatures* (1917). But Homer, three thousand years ago, was dealing with the same material; and after him Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton. The things not dreamed of in the philosophy of the average man have always been favorite subjects for masterpieces. And, naturally, they involve difficulty. It will not do to let one's imagination become cobwebbed or mossgrown. Shelley was almost always living in the clouds; his best descriptions are of some aspect of the sky. How different from Pope, who was always to be found on the comforting levels of "sense"! The consistency with which most of the writers of his period clung to this good sense, or common sense—which is perhaps better named matter-of-fact-ness—explains much of their limpidity and their appeal to unimaginative readers. Swift, however, it must not be forgotten, exhibited a singularly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powerful and sane imagination. Wordsworth held, in his *Intimations of Immortality*, that children live nearest to the supernatural—that "Heaven lies about us in our infancy" and that the adult gradually sees this magic light change into that of common day. The supernatural on its reflective side, however, portrayed so profoundly in *Hamlet*, appeals rather to the wisdom of maturity. *The Tempest* is more fanciful, less serious; but the vision of the dissolving of the great globe itself, "like this insubstantial pageant faded," is justly one of the most celebrated quotations in literature. We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and the master will always, in defiance of possible obscurity, emphasize this mystical element in human existence. Great writers do not defer to stupidity. They will be as clear as their subjects allow them to be; but even they themselves see sometimes as in a glass darkly. It is well, says Mr. Chesterton, to half understand a poem as we half understand life. This is a wise justification of the necessary difficulties of literature of the highest order.

Good writing is a personal vision of life. Knowledge of one masterpiece helps us, to some extent, to understand others; yet each is highly individualized. The familiar maxim, "style is the man," suggests this. On the other hand, natural science aims at establishing similarities—which it promptly calls laws or hypotheses. Conformity is the soul of science; non-conformity, the soul of literature. "'Sblood," says Hamlet, "do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe?" The reader of masterpieces must do more than "govern the ventages" with fingers and thumb; he must acquire, perhaps painfully, the art of playing on the instrument of literature. Popular magazines are a kind of player-piano which require little skill from the reader; or to speak more accurately, they are in a majority of their pages literature reduced to its lowest terms, simplified for the multitude. But life itself is not simple, not wholly intelligible; and good literature, which reflects it, must be correspondingly difficult. To ask a great writer to be absolutely plain is to ask him to be as stupid as we are.

HARRY T. BAKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

APOLLO BOREALIS

BY ANNE C. E. ALLINSON

"DEADLY night is spread over those hapless men"—so Homer pictures the condition of the Cimmerians, who were fabled to live in a cloud-wrapt land on earth's northern border. In his words we catch the teasing echoes of unknown meetings of Vikings and Hellenes in unknown ages on unknown seas. The strange length of the Arctic day was also caught up by Greek legend, for Odysseus reported that in Laestrygonia a shepherd who was bringing his flock home at sunset might pass, with a friendly hail, a shepherd who was taking his sheep to pasture at sunrise. But it was the long Arctic night which stirred a feeling of horror in the dwellers on the bright coasts of the Mediterranean. Their sorriest image of death itself was that of a dark-sailed mission-ship, "upon whose deck Apollo treads not and the sunlight falls not."

In Alexander's time, while India's coral strand was being subdued to Hellenic uses, a dauntless Greek navigator and scientist sailed to the northernmost border of Scotland, and looked off toward an island which the natives told him was the sleeping place of the sun. As Pytheas gazed out into the northern sea, and listened to curious tales of day and night, there swam into the ken of the ancients that Ultima Thule which in succeeding centuries symbolized to geographers, poets and philosophers the "farthest north," the unattainable, the unknowable. Nearly a thousand years later, the island, ever uncharted and unidentified, was still the home of darkness. The Byzantine historian, Procopius, shudderingly describes the psychological effect upon the inhabitants: "When thirty-five days of the long night are passed, certain people are sent up to the tops of mountains, as is the custom with them, and when from thence they can see some appearance of the sun, they send word to the inhabitants below that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in five days the sun will shine upon them. And the latter assemble and celebrate, in the dark, it is true, the feast of the glad tidings. Among the people of Thule this is the greatest of their festivals. I believe that these islanders, although the same thing happens every year with them, nevertheless are in a state of fear, lest sometime the sun should be wholly lost to them."

Not only this island of the sea, but tracts of mainland, were reported to be subject to night and cold. Pliny injects into his sober book on natural history the Roman terror of the North. Along the northern boundary of Scythia—our southern Russia—was supposed to lie a range of mountains, and their bleak uplands he describes as a district of ever-falling snow, a part of the world accursed by nature and shrouded in thick darkness. "It produces nothing," he adds, "but frost, and is the chilly hiding-place of the north wind."

The North Wind—Boreas—how savagely he blazes his wild way down through the classical centuries!

> Out of the north wind grief came forth,
> And the shining of a sword out of the sea.

As sire of the white fillies of the Ægean which rear and dash against the shore, he first appears in Greek mythology. A "whirlwind-footed bridegroom," he ravished the tender princess of primeval Athens, and marred her city's charm with the cruel ways of Thrace. Lending his brutal might, for once, to the cause of right, when Hellas was at bay, he drove the Persian ships to disaster, and earned a tempered gratitude and reluctant shrine from the humane Athenians.

In plainer descriptions of the weather the north wind brought cold and misery wherever it blew. A Bœotian farmer, in a northern storm, could hear the very earth howl, and the woods, up on the slopes of Helicon, roar loud and long. The wild animals crept low to escape the drifting snow, and the oxen cowered in their stalls. The farmer shivered even in his thick underclothes and woollen coat, heavy socks and oxhide shoes. Pulling his cap down over his ears, he stamped his way from barn to kitchen. The Sicilian shepherd groaned, when Boreas chilled his flowers and killed his birds. The ten thousand Greeks in a foreign land, marching back from a futile expedition through Asia Minor to the releasing sea, met the North Wind face to face

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the snowy mountains near the upper waters of the Euphrates. It "scorched and froze them through," Xenophon reported, with sad details of suffering and death among men and beasts. His exact words—whether by memory or by chance—lately echoed from another brave journey, in a still deadlier quarter of the globe. Dr. Wilson, before starting out to die with Captain Scott, described in foreboding verse the rigors of the Antarctic,

> As it scorched and froze us through and through
> With the bite of the drifting snow.

The terror of the South Pole had not laid its grasp upon the imagination of the Mediterranean peoples, who, in the regions below their own sane and temperate clime, guessed only at the mysterious tropics. But the Arctic Circle above haunted them. From it a pall of darkness spread to civilization, a cruel wind blew upon man's spirit, frost and snow chilled the palpitating loveliness of life.

The ancient terror of the North can be detected, not only in troubled echoes of Viking stories, and direct descriptions of the hateful winter of personal experience, but in Greek and Roman dreams of happy regions, fit for gods to dwell in, or for the blessed dead, or for sated and weary toilers who had earned the right to rest. In these lovely places the north wind never burns and freezes, the snow never drifts, the light never fails. As soon as the Greek imagination lifts itself over the edge of history, we find the gods dwelling in a home that always is secure—"neither by winds is it shaken, or ever is it drenched by the showers, nor ever comes near it the snowstorm. But the aether, cloudless, is outspread above it, and bright is the gleam that runs o'er it." Near such an Olympus lay the Elysian fields, even as the traveller today, in approaching the actual mountain, finds meadows of asphodel lying, luminous, under the twilight sky. The matured Greek genius allowed to Pindar a vision of the abode of the righteous dead, from which is excluded any suggestion of darkness and of storm-winds:

> For them the night all through
> In that broad realm below,
> The splendor of the sun spreads endless light;
> Mid rosy meadows bright,
> Their city of the tombs with incense trees,
> And golden chalices

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Of flowers, and fruitage fair,
> Scenting the breezy air,
> Is laden.

But men, worn with battling the elements, forcing food out of the earth, defeating their enemies, fighting against heavy odds for each and every gain, have never been willing to believe that only by divinity or by death could ease and rest be won. So upon the map of this world have been laid the Happy Isles,

> Cradled and hung in clear tranquility.

The desire for them has been well-nigh universal. Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Irishmen and Welshmen, Icelanders, all have believed that somewhere in the sea might be found these islands, touched only by the warmer winds, given over to an eternal spring, unmarred by blight or chill, by sickness or old age, by sorrow or sin. Nor has English poetry allowed science wholly to wrest from our sobered minds a beautiful dream of

> Lands indiscoverable in the unheard of west,
> Round which the strong stream of a sacred sea
> Rolls without wind forever, and the snow
> There shows not her white wings and windy feet.

To the Greeks and Romans, who knew so little of the west, it seemed probable that happy isles might lie in that actual geographical direction. It was in western seas that Odysseus was forever meeting with those enchantments of nature and of woman which made him forget his gaunt and rock-ribbed Ithaca and the rigors of domestic fidelity. Then, as navigation enlarged its bounds, and travellers' tales increased, legendary islands of the old sagas seemed really to be described in the west beyond the daily thoroughfares. At last, in the year preceding Julius Cæsar, they emerge, with clear outlines, in a story of the Roman general Sertorius—a story which is typical of ageless human desire. Sertorius had served his country well against external foes, only to be hounded out of Rome by political enemies. Driven again from his Spanish refuge, in danger of his life, he was told by sailors of some islands called the Islands of the Blest: "Rains fall there seldom and in moderate showers, but for the most part they have gentle breezes, bringing along with them soft dews, which render the soil not only rich for ploughing and planting, but so abundantly fruitful that it produces spon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taneously an abundance of delicate fruits, sufficient to feed the inhabitants, who may here enjoy all things without trouble or labor. The seasons of the year are temperate and the transitions from one to another so moderate that the air is always serene and pleasant. The rough northerly and southerly winds which blow from the coasts of Europe and Africa, dissipated in the vast open space, utterly lose their force before they reach the islands. The soft western and southerly winds which breathe upon them sometimes produce gentle sprinkling showers, which they carry along with them from the sea, but more usually bring days of moist bright weather, cooling and gently fertilizing the soil. When Sertorius heard this account, he was seized with a wonderful passion for these islands, and had an extreme desire to go and live there in peace and quietness and safe from oppression and unending wars."

The Happy Isles, described by sailors to this unhappy general, are interpreted by historians to be the Canaries on the coast of Africa. But dreams move on swift wings and the imagination has ever carried the home of happiness further and further on. Horace, in the days of his youthful revolt, threw it far beyond Rome and the Etruscan sea. Centuries later Bishop Berkeley applied the famous Horatian description of peace and virtue to the Bermudas, where he hoped to find, for letters and art, a blessed asylum from the decadence of Europe.

Westward the course of empire takes its way, exclaimed this dreamer. And any inhabitant of southern California will tell you—and persuade most of you—that the Happy Isles, god-driven over the face of the waters, have at last come to anchorage in the Pacific, and found their true incarnation in our Land of the Golden West. Thus, in flight from Boreas, we have sailed, even as Odysseus sailed, from sea to western sea, following the chart handed to us by the first Greek bard.

But in mad denial—welling up from unplumbed depths of being—my own vessel refuses to make port. Another course to freedom impels my sails. It is a course charted by the same Hellenes who sent me westward. It is a harsh, forbidding route, straight northward into the dread lair of the North Wind. But the quest will lead out beyond storms into peace, beyond terrors into happiness, beyond darkness into day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Greeks started the story of a blessed and contented race which dwelt *beyond Boreas*. It is described in a matter-of-fact way by Pliny, in connection with his wild Rhipæan mountains: "By these mountains and beyond the North Wind dwells, if we are willing to believe it, a happy people, the Hyperboreans, who have long life and are famous for many marvels which border on the fabulous." Modern philologists would have us believe that a mere false derivation brought these people into being. But nursed by the myth-makers and poets, their life has persisted. The Hyperboreans have been even more real than the Hesperides. The vigor of a belief in their existence is proved by the fact that on the geographical maps of the twelfth century of our era they occupy, with sturdy realism, the most northern regions of the earth.

By an amazing paradox, the early stories of these northerners make them ministers, in a special sense, of the God of Light. Apollo pierced the world's darkness in the Greek sky, in the Greek intellect, in the Greek charm. And yet this personified Radiance loved the Hyperboreans. He who never set foot on Charon's boat often crossed the ferry of the North. Happy in his favor, this hyperboreal people bound "golden bay leaves in their hair, and made them merry cheer."

Is it not possible that, today, the descendants of these bay-crowned victors are to be found among those who make themselves at home in harsh and stormy dwelling-places? At least in one quality these people resemble the Hyperboreans of old. For the North they cherish a passion which places them beyond the North Wind, in a contentment as sweet, a happiness as beautiful as ever existed in the Happy Isles. The poetry of our own northern tongue reflects this passion again and again. One English poet even puts it into the mouth of Odysseus, as he spurns a western island of pleasaunce:

> This odorous, amorous isle of violets,
> That leans all leaves into the glassy deep,
> With brooding music over moontide moss,
> And low dirge of the lily-swinging bee—
> Then stars like opening eyes on closing flowers—
> Palls on my heart. Ah, God! that I might see
> Gaunt Ithaca stand up out of the surge,
> Yon lashed and streaming rock and sobbing crag,
> The screaming gull and the wild-flying cloud.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the northern heart there has always been, in some homesick hour, a farther north. From the gaudy melon-flowers and the nightingales of Italy the Englishman turns back to his vernal buttercups and thrushes—

> O to be in England
> Now that April's there!

The Scot, hearing the April breezes of England, longs for his ruder winds—

> Soughing through the fir-tops up on northern fells.

From Scotland men have sailed to Thule. From Thule they have been driven on, by an inward urge, into the centre of those strange regions which Pytheas was told could be traversed neither by foot nor sail. Legend and poetry and history have marked their brave and impassioned course, through many centuries, until, at the North Pole, a son of the North fulfilled all northern dreams, and planted amid snow and ice the flag of a nation whose earliest traditions include a stern and rockbound northern coast.

In this flag the star which is Peary's is also my own. The bit of cosmic dust that I know as myself was blown into Maine by the North Wind on a January night. The North, then, is my *querencia.* On our great western ranches, it is found that grazing animals, when spring stirs the blood, will kick up their heels and make for their *querencia,* or birth-place. A lame old mule will accomplish in one day of ardent return a distance which consumes three days, when he is haled away again with prod and halter. His owner has known where to seek him, for, against just such occurrences, each animal's nostalgia is listed in the records of the ranch. If I ever disappear from my paddock, I must be sought on the trail of the north star.

When, like Sertorius and yourself, I wish to escape from life's oppressions and unending wars, I turn to no dream of western islands, whose flowers and fruits glow with color in the persistent sunshine. Rather would I see the polar sun shine on glittering fields of snow, or know the "gray and shadowless light" of cloudy polar days, and the starlight, "cold and spectral," of the Arctic night. Indeed, my desire toward the North is so strong that I have always been more interested in its night and day than in the same grim phe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomena of the Antarctic Circle. Of this I was half ashamed, viewing it as a bit of sentimental unreality, until I read of the mood in which Amundsen discovered the southern pole. The quite prosaic words of the Norwegian Hercules, on the accomplishment of his labor in the South, constitute an extraordinary tribute to the hold upon him of the North: "The goal was reached, the journey ended. I cannot say—though I know it would sound much more effective—that the object of my life was attained. That would be romancing rather too barefacedly. I had better be honest and admit straight out that I have never known any man to be placed in such a diametrically opposite position to the goal of his desires as I was at that moment. The regions around the North Pole—well, yes, the North Pole itself—had attracted me from childhood, and here I was at the South Pole. Can anything more topsy-turvy be imagined?" Thus at the very height of achievement abroad the northerner's *querencia* draws him back.

Now, a lover of the North—a Hyperborean—finds in his blessed region the Beauty which the Mediterranean imagination denied to Thule and the Rhipæan mountains and the cloud-wrapt city of the Cimmerians. No poetry is richer in descriptions of nature's sheer physical loveliness than that written in our language about those four dramatic seasons of the year of which three are excluded from the Happy Isles of the West. How could it be otherwise, when our spring leaps like a flushed, awakening child from the lap of winter, our summer blooms with the beauty and the brevity of the rose, our autumn flames with colors of the Orient, and our winter strips all disguises from the lovely forms of trees, lays its red sheen upon the twilight horizons, and covers the shame of the barren earth with the excuse of the virgin snow?

This beauty for the eye grows only more amazing as we push northward. Strange and eerie seemed to Pytheas the tales of the confusion of day and night in the indiscoverable regions beyond the Scottish coast. But this is the way such a Laestrygonian land looked last July to a young Hyperborean, from the deck of an ocean steamer, which, en route for Scandinavia, had ploughed its way up from Scotland to the Faroë islands: "It was still light enough to read on deck at eleven, and then, as we walked up and down the deck, watching the islands, we suddenly realized that it was growing lighter instead of darker, and that the sunset glow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the north was turning into dawn. Between eleven and twelve o'clock it was just twilight enough so that one star shone overhead, very dimly; in the north was the sunset, turning to dawn, in the south the full moon, and, just ahead, the islands. There are cliffs on them, sheer cliffs that drop seventeen hundred feet into the sea, and blue peaks behind, rising up two thousand feet, with patches of snow on them. Then, all day and all night, we had seagulls flying round us, and, as it began to grow brighter, their white bodies would catch the light like a flash of sun between their black wings. The sea was perfectly flat, even the wind died down, till, finally, just before sunrise, the sea was like a mirror with only the waves of our own wake and a ripple here and there from a pull of wind, or broken in spreading triangles, when a family of ducks would spin along the surface in Indian file, and then dive one after the other. And all the while it grew brighter, and we came nearer to the islands, and their great cliffs and jagged peaks stood out more wonderfully. The north grew like a rosy furnace, with little curly clouds all molten gold, and the south was long ribbons of pink above the islands—and the pale full moon and the flying gulls—and the Eastern rim of the ocean was like the white lip of a plate, and you thought of the Water Babies. Suddenly there was a shout of *skoal* from the Norwegians, and you saw a liquid green flame lift itself over the horizon like a great aqua marine that turned to fiery red as you looked at it. Then the hills caught the light, and the grass became green, and you picked out a tiny white town, and the surf breaking at the foot of the cliffs, and one long white thread that quivered and became a water-fall."

Northward—ever northward—beauty persists beyond all the white towns inhabited by men. The darkness of the long Arctic night seemed horrible to navigators of southern seas. But Hyperboreans know that Apollo's substitute—the *aurora borealis*—may dim the brightest moon that ever inlaid with fairy silver the golden sunlight of a western isle. Beyond the reach of any but the most enduring—so we are told by the intrepid few—exists a night illumined by glowing fire-masses, by rays sparkling with the red and violet and green of the rainbow, by a phantasmagoria of living color surpassing anything that man can dream.

The Hyperborean does not deny the curse of Nature. Darkness and cold and desolation seem as real to him as to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any other mortal. He has moments of intense craving to escape, as when Nansen felt that for a safe return he would willingly offer up the chance of victory. But in the long run the Hyperborean is more likely to leave his body a victim of the North's worst cruelties, than to consummate any such sacrifice of his soul. The very night, even if unillumined, appeals to forces buried deep within his own nature. His eye may be offended, but his spirit is satisfied. There is a mystery here, in which only initiates can be partakers. The throng which seeks the southern sun and western breeze has no understanding of a man who is happy in "wresting from the realm of darkness," and mapping out on his chart, a land that is barren and stony, foggy and ice-bound, the long year through. But the initiates of the North know why Amundsen, in opening up the wild Northwest Passage, garnered from the infinite wastes "new conceptions of greatness, beauty and goodness."

The path to this kind of satisfaction lies straight through the chilly hiding places of the North Wind. Not by fleeing westward, but by pushing northward, can be secured the contentment of the Hyperboreans. Knowing night at its worst, they attain to veritable faith in the day. Nansen lay for months in a cave hollowed in the snow, with only one companion, with no books, no occupations, no sunlight, while above him a glacier writhed horribly, like a giant in torment, and sent out groans which alone tore the terrible northern stillness. And yet his mind, by conquering this monstrous darkness, remained sane, and ready to greet the light. "Outside," so his journal runs, "it is growing gradually lighter day by day; the sky above the glacier in the south grows redder, until at last one day the sun will rise above the crest." Here is no fear, such as timorous strangers have imagined us to feel, that this time the sun is lost to us forever.

Of all his worshippers Apollo took especial joy in the Hyperboreans. Among them, as in some bright and gallant Elysium, he promised to place the souls of hard-tried mortals. Their life he made so fair that "Hyperborean fortune" became proverbial. According to their faith in his reappearance after the night, and their vitality in awaiting him, he rewarded them with the gifts of his spirit. Hence, in all ages, beyond darkness has been found the ministry of Light.

ANNE C. E. ALLINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

A FABLE FOR LOVERS [1]

BY LAWRENCE GILMAN

Of course the first thing you will ask when you find yourself once again in the Woodcutter's cottage, with the Blue Bird singing in his silver cage on the wall, is: "What has become of Mytyl?" Well, you may as well know it at once: You are not to see much of Mytyl this time (although she does appear at the very end), for this is Tyltyl's hour, and a very crowded hour it is—he has not been long in view before he is surrounded, and thenceforth constantly environed, by no less than seven sweethearts. Amazingly constant are these sweethearts of Tyltyl — and amazingly amicable toward one another, when you consider that they are all very much attached to Tyltyl, and that each of the seven is aware of the love-lorn state of the other six. It seems impossible, until the Fairy Bérylune explains it all quite simply and acceptably: it is because Tyltyl is wearing the Magic Sapphire in his green hat, and that enables him to see deep down into their souls, the truth of their hearts and the well-spring of their lives; and, of course, Truth being Beauty (as Tyltyl's creator learned from a certain predecessor) he sees them with innocence, gladness, and lovely amiability radiating from each adoring presence. A marvellous sapphire, indeed!—as Tyltyl realized when he lost the miraculous green hat and came upon the Sweethearts screaming and fighting and tearing one another's hair and scratching one another's faces: for then he saw them, as the Fairy Bérylune explained, as they were *not*: "It's all so wonderfully simple: anything that's ugly isn't true, never has been true—and never will be. . . . When you see what you do see, you

[1] *The Betrothal*, by Maurice Maeterlinck. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1918.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

see nothing at all. I've told you before, it's what you do not see that makes the world go round." From which you will know that Tyltyl's creator is up to his old tricks again, and is still trying to persuade us, as he tried long ago, that "if at this moment you think or say something that is too beautiful to be true in you . . . on the morrow it will be true."

But, as we were saying, it was to be a crowded hour for Tyltyl, and we must get back to our recording of it.

Seven years have passed since Tyltyl said to us across the footlights that if any of us should find the Blue Bird, we were please to give it back, as they should "need it for their happiness." Evidently Tyltyl, or the Fairy Bérylune, or some one, did find it, for here it is, as we remarked, singing in its cage on the wall; and Tyltyl is sixteen; and sound asleep in his bed.

"And what in the living world can happen to a man that is asleep on his bed? Work must go on and coach-building must go on, and they will not go on the time there is too much attention given to dreams. A dream is a sort of shadow, no profit in it to anyone at all." It is the voice of the eternal materialist, as dramatized by a Celtic blood-brother of Tyltyl's creator; and the answer might have been spoken by Light, or the Fairy Bérylune, or Tyltyl himself later on: "There are some would answer you that it is to those who are awake that nothing happens, and it is they who know nothing. He that is asleep on his bed is gone where all have gone for supreme truth." Tyltyl, asleep on his bed, is engaged upon precisely that quest.

When we see him first, he is not the only one who appears to be asleep: a dog and a cat are asleep near the fireplace—but that, we regret to say, is all we see of them. As for our old friends Milk, and Sugar, and Bread, they are nowhere in evidence. Ah, well, one cannot ask too much of the past, and it is not difficult to content ourselves with Tyltyl, and the Fairy Bérylune, and Light the benign and lovely and wise, and Granny Tyl and Gaffer Tyl, and Mummy and Daddy Tyl—these come to us again out of the remembered years.

But, more important still, there are new friends, singular and delectable and exciting. There are, first of all, the Seven Sweethearts of Tyltyl—Milette the Woodcutter's Daughter, and Belline the Butcher's Daughter, and Roselle the Inn-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keeper's Daughter, and Aimette the Miller's Daughter, and Jalline the Beggar's Daughter, and Rosarelle the Mayor's Daughter—the only one, by the way, who is rich and haughty, though she fared no better in the end for being that, as you will see; and finally, there is the Veiled Girl, who never speaks or laughs, and whom Tyltyl is unable to recognize—she whose features, said the Great Ancestor, were like those of an unfinished statue. As for the Great Ancestor himself, he is probably the most rewarding of our new friends in the Country of the Blue Bird. Although, to be sure, he was not much of a help to Tyltyl in his momentous quest.

What was that quest? one may begin to ask. Why, it was nothing less than the quest for his predestined bride. It may seem at first blush as if Tyltyl, who is not yet sixteen, is a little young to concern himself about so consequential a matter; but what would be the use of living in the Country of the Blue Bird if one couldn't fall in love and marry as early as one chose? The Country of the Blue Bird is not the draconian State of New York, where it is useless for you to seek a bride until you are twenty-one, unless you can show your parents' written consent to the License Clerk. But inasmuch as Tyltyl did not live in the Empire State, it was quite proper for the Fairy Bérylune to urge him forth upon a quest for his mate. This time, she tells him impressively, they are not concerned with the souls of Bread, Sugar, and other simple and unimportant things: they are to choose the great and only love of Tyltyl's life. For each man has only one, and if he misses it, he wanders miserably over the face of the earth; the search goes on till he dies, with the great duty unfulfilled which he owes to all those who are within him. But he seldom has an idea of this. He walks along, his eyes shut; seizes some woman whom he chances to meet in the dark, and shows her to his friends as proudly as though the gates of Paradise were opening. He fancies himself alone in the world and imagines that in his own heart all things begin and end. Which is absurd, of course. So tonight they must put their heads together and prepare for the Great Choice, which is to decide the happiness of two human beings first and of many others after that.

It is then that the bewildered Tyltyl discovers that it is not he who will choose—that it doesn't concern him at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all—that he can't love whom he wants to. Nobody loves whom he wants to or does what he wants to in this world. He must first learn what is wanted by those on whom he depends—his ancestors, to begin with, and then all his children—the thousands who aren't born yet and who are waiting for the mother whom he is going to give them. It is they who will choose his bride.

So they set forth upon the Great Journey, Tyltyl and the Fairy Bérylune and the enamoured Seven—who have begun sadly to realize that in Tyltyl's case there is no use, since he is not a Mohammedan, in hoping to apply the indulgent rule of the Koran: "Take one wife, or two or three or four, but never more." They are joined by a strange and awful personage, a colossal granite Shape, twice the height of a man, shrouded in gray rock-like draperies. "It's nobody, it's Destiny," says the Fairy Bérylune; "I had forgotten him. He will have to come with us." So, with Tyltyl's hand gripped in the huge, bronze-colored, vise-like fist of Destiny, they pass out through the wall, which opens accommodatingly down to the ground, led, of course, by Destiny; for is he not, as he says, "Insuperable, Invulnerable, Immutable, Inexorable, Irresistible, Inflexible, and Irrevocable"?

The expenses of the trip will be heavy; so Tyltyl secures gold from the Miser (who, under the compulsion of Tyltyl's sapphire, is transformed into a figure of gracious benevolence); they are joined by Light, and, after duly adventuring through perils and allurements, in palaces and dens of terror, they reach the Abode of the Ancestors. Here are all of Tyltyl's ancestors since the world began: one who was a grocer at Versailles in the reign of Louis the Fifteenth; a beggar from the twelfth century; men of the Stone Age; Romans, savages, courtiers, knights, freebooters and knaves—chiefly, the Great Ancestor, who looks like a Cave-man with his garb of skins and his big stick. He, with the Great Peasant and the Great Mendicant, are to choose from among the devoted Seven the woman whom Tyltyl is to love and marry.

It is hardly strange that Tyltyl should resent this interference, and should feel a little as the rustic felt when offered ox-tail soup—that this was "going pretty far back for soup." "I and the others," explains the Great Ancestor, "are all you. You are we, we are you; and it's all the same thing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Those who have lived in you, live in you just as much as those who are going to." So the love-lorn Seven all file *in front of the ancient court; but alas, though it is very sad,* the hands of the Ancestors are tied: they do not see among six of the Seven the predestined one for whom they are waiting. The veiled figure of the Phantom Girl in white, she of the featureless, enigmatic face, causes them hope and perturbation. Yet if she be the One, Tyltyl *must* remember who she is: if he does not succeed in recognizing her, all his happiness on earth will be nothing more than a phantom like herself. But there is one last resource, one last hope, which is that the children who are to be born of Tyltyl may discover who she is and that she is to be their mother; for they see much farther and deeper than even the Ancestors do.

So, beyond the Milky Way, near to the stars, Tyltyl and his attendants come to the region in which his unborn children are waiting to show him the mother whom they have chosen. It is a little like the Kingdom of the Future in the Country of the Blue Bird—a place of vast, dim spaces, with infinite perspectives, lofty vaults, and towering translucent columns, drenched in a soft azure radiance, while the roof is a vault of myriad unknown stars. But, as Light explains, the Kingdom of the Future was the *whole* Kingdom, "with everybody's children; here it is only a province, in which are no children but yours."

So Tyltyl awaits the verdict of his children; and it scarcely surprises you that when they come trooping in, ravishing in their cerulean nighties and their bobbed curls, they pass by Rosarelle and Jalline and Belline and Milette and Aimette and Roselle, and, led by The Smallest of Them All, go straight to the voiceless, featureless White Phantom, whom they greet rapturously with kisses and caresses; whereupon the eyes of the White Phantom open, her lips flutter, her arms become supple and circle round their necks. "It is she. . . . I found her," The Smallest of Them All announces to Tyltyl. But Tyltyl cannot yet remember her. They warn him that this is hurting her dreadfully, and her color pales and her eyes shut, and the hall darkens and dissolves, and the children and their mother vanish with it, and Tyltyl is left dreaming of her beauty, and wondering who the Predestined One may be—you hope that he is not thinking a little resentfully of M. Maeterlinck's confident

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assurance, once upon a time, to all lovers: "When Fate sends forth the woman it has chosen for us . . . and she awaits us at the crossing of the road we have to traverse when the hour comes, we are warned at the first glance." You cannot blame Tyltyl for wondering why *he* was not warned.

Later, of course, he does remember. He wakes up to find himself in his bed (oddly enough, with his clothes on). The Blue Bird is singing madly in his cage, and Mummy Tyltyl is lighting a fire, preparing for a visit from Neighbor Berlingot and his wife and their daughter Joy, to whom Tyltyl once gave the Blue Bird. And when they arrive, and Joy is seen to be tall and beautiful and tender-eyed, it needs no one to explain to Tyltyl that Joy and the anonymous Veiled Phantom are one and the same, and that Tyltyl has at last found the true lady of his heart.

As for Destiny, he has shrunk most pitifully from scene to scene and is now merely a small complaining baby, whom Jalline and Milette take turns carrying about in their arms, and who finally goes whiningly to sleep in Milette's cape. "Poor little Destiny!" says Light, "he has no luck."

If there be puzzled observers who complain that M. Maeterlinck, at the same time that he shows us Love and the heart's elected as foreordained and inevitable, also shows us the Fate who builds our destinies as a futile, puling creature of no account, he might, if he chose, comfort himself by repeating the words of the Arabian sage, Kahlil Gibran: "Those who understand us enslave something in us." Or, if he cared to take the trouble, he might remind his critics that, if they cannot perceive the truth which lies so close to the surface of his lovely fable, they can find it soberly set forth in that earlier sheaf of noble meditations, *Wisdom and Destiny,* where he tells us that while "it is true that some kind of predestination governs every circumstance of life, it appears to be no less true that such predestination exists in our character only; and to modify character must surely be easy to the man of unfettered will, for is it not constantly changing in the lives of the vast bulk of men? . . . It is our most secret desire that governs and dominates all. If your eyes look for nothing but evil, you will always see evil triumphant; but if you have learned to let your glance rest on sincerity, simpleness, truth, you will ever discover, deep down in all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things, the silent overpowering victory of that which you love."

The truth is, of course, that M. Maeterlinck, like all mystical poets, throws out his creations to be "apprehended, not dissected," as Mr. Meredith once remarked of a creation of his own. If he is to be dissected at all, it must be by the elect; so we shall make no further attempts in that direction. But it is open to the dullest to find in this exquisite fantasy treasures of loveliness and humor to be laid by in the memory, especially as they are pointed and enriched in the well-nigh perfect projection of the play by Mr. Winthrop Ames at the Shubert Theatre—wherein, from the acting of the admirable company of players, to the sensitive and reinforcing incidental music of Mr. Eric Delamater and the enchanting *mise-en-scène,* one finds a conspiracy of skill and eloquence directed to the exalting of a great poet and the telling of a most memorable dream.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

THE BIOLOGY OF WAR. By G. F. Nicolai, formerly professor of physiology in the University of Berlin. New York: The Century Company.

In Germany, it would seem, the pacifist-militarist debate has never been carried to the point of obviousness and satiety which was soon reached in most other countries; for in Germany the militarists have had things all their own way, and the militaristic philosophy has been official. It is not surprising, then, that a German scientist, opposing the official and well-nigh universal view, should write somewhat elaborately, somewhat lengthily, somewhat wordily, on themes that now seem to most Americans susceptible of a somewhat concise and clear-cut treatment. Dr. Nicolai, in writing *The Biology of War,* had to deal with fallacies that were taken by most of his countrymen for self-evident axioms; moreover, he had to penetrate the German mind, which is not easily to be reached by direct methods and is somewhat dense to simple truths.

It is to be remembered, too, that Dr. Nicolai is not, like the author *J'Accuse,* a sort of Junius, but merely a conscientious man of science, who would fain have been simply scientific and objective, would the authorities but have taken his views in that sense! The authorities would not. Dr. Nicolai's book was written in the fortress of Graudenz, in which the author was imprisoned because of his anti-militaristic opinions. The manuscript was conveyed to Switzerland, where it was published by the firm of Orell Füssli of Zurich.

Dr. Nicolai, however, in his prison wrote less bitterly to the German people, and of them, than did the author of *J'Accuse* or than Wilhelm Mühlon, formerly of Krupps, both of whom wrote in freedom. He even shows a desire, almost pathetic in its suppressed patriotism, to conciliate popular opinion and to discover some partial justification for the official view. There might conceivably be some justification, he thinks, for a war—of extermination! Yet in no way does Dr. Nicolai compromise with his conscience. Ordinary wars—wars of conquest, wars of nations—he consistently holds have no sound biological reason, and hence no ethical defense.

A slashing satirist, like the author of *J'Accuse,* would not have missed the opportunity to point out that if any war of extermination might justifiably be waged, the German people would be the fittest object of such a war. But sarcasm of this sort is far from the thoughts of Dr. Nicolai. He seems quite serious in his contention that Europe may sometime have to depopulate Asia, though he by no means regards

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a contingency with pleasure and is happy to discover, as he thinks, a more excellent way.

First and last, Dr. Nicolai is a scientist who finds his morals in his science—not a writer inspired by moral passion, who finds his weapons in science and in politics.

Dr. Nicolai, then, labors, with the patience and the simplicity of a scientist—with all the scientist's faith in detailed demonstration—to correct views which in America no considerable number of persons have ever professed, except, as it were, accidentally, in the heat of the Preparedness agitation. His point of view is that of a biologist in the broader sense.

A biologist in the broader, or for that matter in the narrower, sense may have the merit of strict impartiality in dealing with questions of human conduct; but he may also suffer from a certain limitation. It may be remarked that books about the biology of things which lack flesh and blood are sometimes difficult to distinguish from books altogether unscientific. Like works written by laymen, they may, and too often do, treat somewhat fragmentarily and unsatisfactorily of several different sciences, and also of philosophy. And so Dr. Nicolai, not being professionally a political economist, or by training a philosopher, seems somewhat too sure of his biologico-economic deductions, and not quite sure enough of his philosophical thesis.

As to economics, Dr. Nicolai has no hesitation in denying that national well-being increases with increased power of consumption; for, to be sure, "national well-being does not become greater because all manner of superfluous trash, such as oleographs and shell-covered boxes, is palmed off upon the working classes." Property, the author continues, has *engendered* theft and war. Property appears, indeed, to be almost an unmixed evil, though it may be admitted that it has a certain virtue as an incentive "for feeble souls who will not exert themselves save in the hope of becoming possessed of some tangible object." If Dr. Nicolai is not blind to the fact that the "economic motive" is the great fly-wheel of society, he surely means that some other steadying device shall be substituted for it—perhaps government ownership of the means of production and government direction of labor. Just here, one has occasion to remember that the only protest—such as it was!—against autocracy in Germany has come from the Socialists, and that the domestic policy of the German Empire has accustomed all Germans to think of state socialism as a perfectly proper and reasonable policy.

If a socialist bent is discernible in some of Dr. Nicolai's rather extreme views on economics, a somewhat uncritical faith in the possibilities of science is noticeable in others. Science, the author gives us to understand, will solve all economic problems, and open the way for the indefinite expansion of mankind. If men do not learn to live in some sort of Bird-Cloudland, they will at least make the earth support vastly increased numbers of men. Synthetic foods—— But Germany, one may imagine, will not warm to the idea of synthetic foods for the future. Rats, said one German citizen, might not be so bad—what he dreaded was the introduction of "synthetic rat"!

As to philosophy, Dr. Nicolai reveals a somewhat Positivistic frame of mind—a disposition to keep philosophy and morals within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bounds that biology can mark out. And yet he has outlined a conception of religion and of morality that is noble and essentially clear.

The road by which the author arrives at this conception is well trodden. Better observers, more competent topographers, have passed over it before him.

War, says Dr. Nicolai, is not a primitive instinct. On the contrary men, like animals, are by nature rather peaceful than warlike. The source of war is property—or, more specifically, slavery (property in human beings), and, later, exploitation. "Whether war really does make exploitation possible is a question. At any rate, this is the object of war, and therefore, if slavery were really abolished, there would be no longer any object in war; and as a matter of fact, *there is no object in it in so far as slavery has been abolished. . . . Every one who defends war under any conditions whatever ought to know that in doing so he is advocating slavery.*" There is no possibility, then, of a war arising out of disinterested differences of opinion—out of religious differences perhaps? However this may be, war is a passing phase in the development of civilization. It made its appearance with the acquisition of property; for a time it had an economic justification; but it soon became, as it is now, retrograde.

An *exclusively* war-like culture, if such a thing were possible, would result in biological deterioration. Men who were adapted through ages to constant warfare would lose many valuable traits. For example, they would probably lose their sense of smell—a worse than useless function to those who have to endure the stench of corpses. They would not become courageous—quite the contrary. War, as an ordeal endured for a high motive, does indeed call forth courage, though it cannot create it. But war as a way of life tends strongly to emphasize "the better part of valor." Even as things are, we see that war does not select the bravest for survival; it kills off selectively the brave and the physically fit, or destroys fit and unfit indifferently.

Perhaps the shrewdest and most original paragraph that Dr. Nicolai has written is that wherein he correlates with certain other human phenomena the narrow and embittered nationalism that has been at the root of so many useless wars.

That we are all members of one body, that we are all parts of the same being, that consequently we cannot hurt one another without hurting ourselves and damaging what is of most value in ourselves—it is in this faith essentially that the world must unite; it is this faith that many are now groping for. Whoever will convince of this truth those who do not already hold it on religious grounds, and so convince them that they will not become pacifists or sentimentalists or vegetarians, will do a great thing.

Dr. Nicolai in part accomplishes this great task. In part he succeeds in connecting the aspirations of men to-day with biological truth. The idea of internationalism is no new thing; the idea of the immortality of the germ-plasm is no new thing—Samuel Butler, for one, worked out its consequences in philosophy long ago, and it is Butler, not Nicolai, who is the discoverer of a biological God. But the conjunction of these two ideas is novel and opportune, and it may prove to be the starting point of a new force.

There seems to be, indeed, a kind of Positivist perversity in speak-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of the human germ-plasm as if it were identical with the soul, and in confining all religion to purely human phenomena—as if God had nothing to do with the law of gravitation! But if Dr. Nicolai is too much of a specialist to be a complete philosopher, he is a man sufficiently large-minded and large-hearted to make his learning flow in broader and deeper channels than those of a special science.

THE CRADLE OF THE WAR. By H. Charles Woods, F.R.G.S. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

To Americans, if not to most Europeans, the Balkan question, so far as it has entered consciousness at all, has seemed a mysterious muddle—and with reason. How is one to see through a situation depending upon narrow national aims, romantic national aspirations, and bitter national jealousies—a question further complicated by doubtful racial considerations, and by intrigues, interferences, and hopelessly false "settlements" on the part of the great Powers. Turkey, an anachronism; Albania, a picturesque accident; Greece, a contradiction; Serbia, Roumania, Bulgaria, all nations stirred by that urge to a wider nationality which created the great states of the world—a medieval situation bottled up in a corner of modern Europe—what could be harder to understand—or more dangerous?

The Balkan peninsula was the cradle of the war; for though it did not produce the cause for the great conflict, it did supply the occasion. It was, and had been for a century before 1914, a hot-bed of potential wars. And, so far as one can see, it may easily continue to be just that.

The Balkan question, then, is of great importance, and now that America has become, in the true sense of the expression, a world Power it is for Americans to inform themselves about this problem.

In trying to inform oneself concerning the Balkan situation the beginning of wisdom lies, however, in realizing that in all probability no perfect solution of the problem exists. Ready-made formulas are of no use in dealing with so tangled a web of conditions. Either a good many of the old conditions must be swept quite away, or there must be a just and wise adjustment of conflicting interests.

Under these circumstances what one needs is facts rather than theories—not such facts as one can readily dig out of the encyclopedias and the history books, but the really significant facts known to few and understood by fewer. Facts of this sort, cautiously stated, carefully reasoned, are just what Mr. H. Charles Woods has given us in his latest book about the Balkans. In Mr. Woods's book there is a notable absence of political theorizing. The author speaks from a point of view at once geographical and political—in short from a scientific point of view. His, moreover, is the book of a man determined to understand all that can be understood about a complex and obscure matter. He has gathered his information very largely on the spot, and he has weighed and sifted his material in such a way as not so much to display new and attractive political patterns as to reveal glaringly the real difficulties of the situation as it existed prior to the world war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Balkan wars, Serbia had gained enormously in territory and in prestige; and yet a mysterious gloom pervaded the whole country. Serbia had not obtained what she really wanted and needed, a port upon the Adriatic. But on the other hand, Austria-Hungary, the traditional enemy, quite as much as is Turkey, of Serbian aspirations, was almost as thoroughly discontented by the peace settlement. She had, indeed, prevented Serbia from getting an outlet upon the Adriatic, and she had "created" Albania, but she had not succeeded in preventing the establishment of a common frontier between Serbia and Montenegro—a common frontier sure to improve the relations between the two latter countries and to enhance Serbian prestige. Of course, the root of the matter lay in the old anomaly of the dual empire and in the intense national longings of the Serbs both in Serbia itself and in Austria-Hungary. No more paradoxical political situation, it would seem, has ever been brought to pass than that which placed a large population of Serbs and their kindred under Austrian control while it permitted the growth of a strong Serb state just to the south of Austria-Hungary.

For the Bulgarians the great war was not so much a world war as a third Balkan war. Their point of view was not admirable, yet in a cool retrospect it seems inevitable. "It is *impossible* but that offences should come!" Certain it was that the Bulgars "would not throw in their lot with any side or countries which did not promise to give them a large section of Southern Macedonia and also as a second consideration to restore to them a section of the Dobrudja and at least part of Turkish Thrace. In other words, the bitter antagonism felt by Bulgaria towards Serbia, Greece, and Roumania outweighed the traditional hostility towards Turkey and weakened the friendship with Russia." Turkey, moreover, had a strong hold upon Bulgaria's lines of communication with the sea. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that Allied diplomacy in the Balkans encountered difficulties. Behind England and France, Bulgaria saw the menace of Russia. And, besides, the Entente Allies were obliged, instead of negotiating for concessions, as Germany did, with one party—and that party, Turkey—to deal with Serbia, Greece, and Roumania—nations which would have been superlatively wise and self-denying if they had been willing to grant all that was asked of them.

Roumania hesitated long before plunging into the war on the right side; but decision of character was for Roumania, as she well knew, a rather expensive virtue. Because of her position that nation obviously could not afford to take sides either with Russia or with Austria-Hungary unless she were assured of the strongest support. But there was another aspect of the problem. She was open to attack from her southern neighbors—an attack all too likely to occur when occasion offered, in view of the events of 1913.

Greece, least glorious of the Balkan nations in the war, offers a wonderful study in the irony of political circumstances. It would be a diverting study to any person of sufficiently Olympic mind to smile over such things. In sum, one cannot discover that the majority of Greeks desired to enter the war upon either side; and one must admit that in this they were as reasonable as are the Dutch. It must be conceded that the King, though perhaps insincerely neutral,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had some reason on his side in not wishing to expose his country to attack from Bulgaria. It is clear that the majority of the Greeks were supporters of Venizelos, but that they were so because Venizelos favored the Allies does not appear. It cannot be said that the Allies, in taking the measures they did in Greece were supported by Greek popular sentiment or that their action can be justified by any form of purely nationalistic reasoning. In the larger view it is not apparent they would have been justified in taking any other course.

In a way, Greece, the would-be neutral, epitomizes the whole situation in the warlike Balkans. A certain medieval or ancient temper of mind, a certain narrowness of political view, seems to prevail. The larger world-view has been absent—just as it was in Russia after the revolution. Left to itself, one conjectures, the Balkan peoples would have worked out their political destinies on much the same principles as did the ancient Greeks. A succession of supremacies would have been the result, until some Philip of Macedon intervened. Bottled up and interfered with, the people of the Balkans were worse off than they would have been under ancient conditions. This much is clear: the disposition of great Powers to oppress and to encroach must be stamped out, and the parochialism of Balkan politics must be replaced by broader views. No "political" solution exists; the solution of the Balkan problem must be a moral solution. Let us hope that there is a spirit abroad capable of altering men's minds in both these ways.

Ancient Greece confronted the Persian Empire as the Balkan states confront the Ottoman Empire. In Turkey Tissaphernes and his fellow satraps still practise their treacheries—though under German direction. Into the obscure welter of Turkish politics Mr. Woods takes us as far as it is possible or perhaps profitable to go. The springs of Turkish intrigue are apparently not altogether discoverable to Europeans. That the key-note of Turkish policy has always been a longing to massacre foreigners is an opinion not wholly unjustifiable. But from a semi-internal point of view one can see the importance of Turkey's gradually improving relations with Bulgaria, and of the augmentation of German influence of Constantinople, and one can understand the futility of the negotiations between Europe and the Ottoman Government with reference to reforms for Armenia. Mr. Woods makes many matters clear in regard to Turkish policy and the diplomacy that shaped or attempted to shape that policy. What stands out most clearly is that Turkey has been to the Balkans not only a menace in the military sense but a moral evil.

Ancient Greece had its "problems" centering about small and seemingly unimportant territories or national groups. But ancient Greece never evolved anything quite so irrational as the Albanian problem. That a small territory should contain so many contradictions is almost beyond belief. Upon the miniature but important Albanian question Mr. Woods throws a much-needed light—a light both geographical and political.

Besides discussing with great thoroughness the political conditions of all the Balkan nations and the part played by each in the war, Mr. Woods discusses in separate chapters and with highly specialized knowledge the military highways of the Balkans, the Dardanelles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

campaign, the operations near Salonika, the Bagdad Railroad, and the whole Mittel-Europa scheme. More than once he succeeds in showing the real reasons of things; many times he warns effectually against hasty judgments.

Mr. Woods has written a book of prime importance, a book that repays and rewards study. Its balanced and guarded conclusions will be found, on reflection, to be more illuminating by far than the quickly assimilated ideas of political essay-writers. Its facts are first-hand facts, and they are invaluable.

FROM ISOLATION TO LEADERSHIP. By John Holladay Latané, professor of American History in the Johns Hopkins University. Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company.

In regard to the American policy of isolation there has been much misapprehension among Americans. It was against "permanent," not "entangling alliances" that Washington warned his countrymen and he did not discountenance temporary alliances to meet special needs. The policy of isolation he regarded, moreover, as itself a temporary expedient. Jefferson, who was the originator of the "entangling alliances" phrase, was on two separate occasions ready to make an alliance with England.

Indeed, it is probable, according to the view of Professor Latané, that neither Washington nor Jefferson "contemplated the possibility of the United States' shirking its responsibility as a member of the family of nations."

Part of the misapprehension regarding this matter has been due to a not unnatural confusion of the policy of isolation with the Monroe Doctrine. Since the latter policy implied a promise that we would keep our fingers out of the European pie, one might readily assume that we were debarred by it from taking any real part in world affairs; but to refrain from interference or aggression, is not the same thing as declining to do one's duty. As Professor Latané says, "there is neither logic nor justice in basing our right to uphold law and freedom in this hemisphere on our promise not to interfere with the violation of law and humanity in Europe."

Moreover, it is an error to suppose that the Monroe Doctrine has depended for its actual effect upon our policy of isolation. It has depended, in fact, upon the European balance of power. It was the approach of the Schleswig-Holstein war, as much as the traditional policy of the United States or its then formidable military force, which induced Louis Napoleon to withdraw Maximilian from Mexico. It was the foreboding of trouble in the Transvaal, rather than his "sense of humor," which caused Lord Salisbury to give way on the Venezuelan question. And it is only because England has, on the whole, favored the Monroe Doctrine, as a kind of open-door policy, that we have been able to maintain that doctrine at all.

Two conclusions, rather surprising to the ordinary reader, emerge from Professor Latané's discussion. The first is that "we have been so scrupulous in our efforts to keep out of political entanglements that we have sometimes failed to uphold principles of law in the validity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of which we were as much concerned as any other nation." The second is that we have taken a larger part in international affairs than most persons are aware. Sometimes our policy was rendered futile for want of force to back it, as in the case of our Open Door Policy in China—an Anglo-American doctrine which remained a theory because we would not unite with England and Japan in an effort to maintain it, if necessary, by force. Sometimes our part has been larger than the American people at the time suspected. Has not André Tardieu stated that the Kaiser sent several telegrams to President Roosevelt, during the Algeciras conference, urging him to modify his instructions to Henry White?

On the whole our participation in the world war has not been in the least contrary to any American principle, nor has it been, except in the large employment of force, wholly out of accord with our previous practise.

Little books on great subjects, when written to order, are seldom of much use. But if scholars generally would form the habit of expressing their views in little books, and would do this as effectively and as judiciously as Professor Latané has done it, the little books would put the big books quite out of fashion. As a resumé of American foreign relations, this volume of Professor Latané's is admirable. It may be regarded, too, as in a sense a "war-aims" book; and if it has a fault, it is that in it the dismal Mexican business preceding the great war is perhaps made to seem a more reasonable and fitting part of a consistent American policy than it really was.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR WAR WITH GERMANY

XXI

(November 7—December 2)

HOSTILITIES with Germany ceased on November 11th. At 5 o'clock on the morning of that day the German armistice commissioners, who had been received by Marshal Foch in his temporary headquarters in a railroad car at Senlis, signed the armistice under which hostilities were to terminate six hours later, and orders were given to the forces along all the fronts to cease firing at 11 o'clock. Thus Germany, last of the quadruple alliance to continue the fight against the forces of civilization and democracy, went out of the war in bitter and complete defeat.

The terms of the armistice were such as to ensure her inability to resume hostilities, no matter what terms of peace ultimately may be imposed upon her. Moreover, the internal conditions within the German Empire were such as practically to preclude the desire on the part of any substantial element of the German people to renew active warfare, no matter how heavily the peace conditions may lie upon them, or how much they may resent the settlement to which ultimately they must agree.

Our record for the past month closed on November 7th with the announcement that a German delegation was on its way to meet Marshal Foch to seek an armistice, preparatory to making peace. This delegation consisted of Mathias Erzberger, Secretary of State, General von Winterfeld, Count Oberndorff, General von Grunel and Naval Captain von Salow. The German high command at Spa in Belgium, communicated by wireless with Marshal Foch expressing the desire to send an armistice delegation to meet him. Marshal Foch by wireless gave directions to the German delegation to approach by the Chimay-LaCapelle-Guise road. Marshal Foch ordered a cessation of firing on that front at 3 o'clock on the afternoon of November 7th, in order to permit the German delegation to approach.

On the afternoon of November 7th news despatches from France were received in New York erroneously reporting the signing of the armistice and the cessation of hostilities. All over the United States the people received the news with spontaneous outbursts of joy, and the supposed end of the war was deliriously celebrated for several hours before official denials from Washington checked the popular enthusiasm.

Early on the morning of November 8th the German delegates were received by Marshal Foch. They asked for an armistice and the Allied Commander-in-Chief immediately read to them the terms upon which the Supreme War Council at Versailles had agreed. He read in a firm,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loud voice and the German delegates seemed stunned by the severity of the terms, as they realized, apparently for the first time, the real character of Germany's defeat. They asked for immediate suspension of hostilities, which Marshal Foch refused. Evidently he did not intend to give the Germans, under cover of such a suspension of fighting, an opportunity to re-form their lines and recover from the effects of the terrific blows he had been delivering all along the front for many days.

The armistice terms required an answer within 72 hours, the time limit expiring at 11 o'clock French time on the morning of November 11th. The German delegates immediately despatched a courier with a copy of the armistice conditions to the German High Command at Spa, and pending his return the assault of the American and Allied armies upon the German lines continued with increased vigor all along the fronts, from the Dutch border to Switzerland.

The signing of the armistice was announced officially at the State Department in Washington at 2.45 o'clock on the morning of November 11th. This was about 8 o'clock French time, three hours after the event had actually occurred. The news spread with extraordinary rapidity throughout the United States and the joyous celebration, which had been cut short by the official denial of the premature announcement four days earlier, was immediately resumed everywhere throughout the country. Congress met at noon and provision was made at once for a joint session to receive President Wilson, who, during the morning, had signified his desire to address Congress and to present the terms of the armistice.

The President appeared before the joint session just after 1 o'clock. He was received with a tremendous demonstration of enthusiasm, and proceeded at once to read the terms of the armistice to which the German delegation had subscribed and by which Germany was in effect pledged in advance to accept the ultimate verdict of the peace conference. The document consisted of thirty-five paragraphs comprising seven sections, dealing with military clauses on the western front; the eastern frontiers of Germany; East Africa; general clauses; naval conditions; duration of armistice and time limit for reply. The military clauses on the western front numbered eleven, and comprised cessation of hostilities six hours after signature; immediate evacuation of invaded countries, to be completed within fourteen days; repatriation of inhabitants of invaded countries; surrender, in good condition, by the German army, of 5,000 guns (2,500 heavy and 2,500 field), 25,000 machine guns, 3,000 minenwerfer, or trench mortars, and 1,700 airplanes, including all the D7's and all the night bombing machines. The German armies were also required to evacuate the countries on the left bank of the Rhine, which will be occupied by Allied and United States troops, holding the chief Rhine crossings, Cologne, Coblenz and Mayence with thirty kilometer bridge heads at each of these points. In addition a ten kilometer neutral zone is established on the right bank of the Rhine from the Dutch border to Switzerland. This occupation of German territories by Allied and American forces is to be at the expense of the German Government. All evacuation by German forces to be without removal of inhabitants or damage to property, and all stores of food, munitions and equipment, as well as military establishments to be left in place, with no impairment of industrial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishment or removal of personnel. All means of communication to be left unimpaired and personnel not removed. Five thousand locomotives and 150,000 cars to be surrendered, in good condition, together with 5,000 motor lorries. The railroads of Alsace-Lorraine, with all materials and stores for working the railways on the left bank of the Rhine to be delivered in good order, and all stores of coal and material for upkeep of railways to be maintained by Germany.

Military clause Number 8 had peculiar significance. It made the German command responsible for revealing all mines or delayed-action fuses left by the German forces in evacuated territory. It also provided that the German command "shall reveal all destructive measures that may have been taken (such as poisoning or polluting of springs and wells, etc.)" This provision of the armistice will be a lasting record, signed by the Germans themselves, of some of their modern methods of warfare.

The military clauses also secured to the Allied and American troops of occupation the right of requisition and provided for the immediate repatriation, without reciprocity, of all Allied and American prisoners of war, including persons under trial or convicted; the repatriation of German prisoners of war to be regulated at the peace conference. German sick and wounded left in the evacuated territory are to be cared for by German personnel.

As to the eastern frontiers, the Germans agreed to withdraw all troops immediately from Austria-Hungary, Roumania and Turkey within German territory as it existed prior to the war, and to withdraw all troops from Russia whenever the Allies say so. Germany renounces the treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk, and ceases all measures for obtaining supplies in Russia and Roumania. The Allies secure free access through Danzig or the Vistula to the territories evacuated by the Germans, for purposes of supply or the maintenance of order.

East Africa to be evacuated by all German forces within a period to be fixed by the Allies.

The general clauses provided for civilian repatriation without reciprocity and for "reparation for damage done." They included also measures for securing this reparation, and no limits were set to the kind, character or amount of reparation, nor was there any specification of what "damage done" should or should not include. Immediate restitution of the cash deposit in the national bank of Belgium was required, with return of the gold taken from Russia and Roumania, which is to be held in trust by the Allies.

In specifying the invaded territory which the Germans were to evacuate at once the armistice terms included Alsace-Lorraine, thus treating it not as territory reconquered from the Germans but as French territory from which the invaders were driven. There are Frenchmen who hold that inasmuch as Germany's title to these provinces rested only on the treaty which Germany ruptured by her declaration of war against France in 1914, the old French title was thereby reinstated and now holds, and that no act of cession by Germany to France is now required or desired.

The fourteen naval clauses deprived Germany of sea power even more effectively than the eleven military clauses stripped her of ability to renew the conflict on land. She was not required to demobilize her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army, as was Austria-Hungary, although she was compelled to surrender its artillery, trench mortars, machine guns, airplanes and vast stores. But her navy she was compelled either to surrender bodily into the keeping of the Allies and the United States, or to disarm and dismantle under the supervision of her enemies. She agreed to the immediate termination of all her war zones and that navigation of all territorial waters should be free to the naval and mercantile fleets of the Allies and the United States, without question of neutrality; naval and mercantile marine prisoners of war to be repatriated immediately, without reciprocity.

The naval vessels she agreed to surrender comprised all her submarines, including cruisers and mine-layers, with their complete armament and equipment. Submarines able to take the sea to be surrendered within fourteen days in a designated Allied port, others to be disarmed of personnel and material and remain under Allied supervision. Six battle cruisers, ten battleships, eight light cruisers (including two mine-layers) and fifty destroyers of the most modern types Germany agreed to turn over for internment at designated Allied ports, there to be disarmed and left with only caretakers on board. All other surface warships to be concentrated in designated German naval bases completely disarmed and placed under supervision of the Allies. The Allies to have the right to sweep up all mine fields and obstructions laid by Germany outside her territorial waters, Germany to indicate their positions. The Allies secured freedom of naval and mercantile access to and from the Baltic, with the right to occupy all German forts, fortifications, batteries and defense works of all kinds in all the entrances from the Cattegat into the Baltic, and to sweep up all mines and obstructions, within and without German territorial waters, Germany to indicate their positions.

Germany agreed that the existing blockade should continue, and that German merchant ships found at sea should remain liable to capture. German naval aircraft are to be concentrated and immobilized in designated German bases. Germany leaves intact all naval and mercantile marine material, merchant ships, tugs, lighters and aeronautical apparatus and supplies of every kind in evacuated ports. She evacuates all Black Sea ports and surrenders all Russian war vessels, abandoning all marine materials of every kind. Any Allied or American merchant vessels in German hands she must surrender in designated ports without reciprocity. All German interference, by contract, agreement or otherwise, with neutrals and the trading of their vessels, is immediately cancelled, and no transfers of German merchant vessels of any description to any neutral flag are to be made.

The armistice runs for thirty days, with option to extend, the evacuation of occupied territories to conclude within fourteen days and of the German territories on the left bank of the Rhine within an additional sixteen days.

The Germans had seventy-two hours in which to accept or refuse these terms.

After reading the armistice terms the President went on briefly to address Congress. "The war thus comes to an end," he said, "for, having accepted these terms of armistice it will be impossible for the German command to renew it. . . . Armed imperialism such as the men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conceived who were but yesterday the masters of Germany, is at an end, its illicit ambitions engulfed in black disaster."

Then, referring to the fact that the Supreme War Council at Versailles had unanimously assured the peoples of the Central Powers that everything possible would be done to supply them with food, the President suggested that the idle German and Austrian merchant tonnage might be used "to lift the fear of utter misery from their oppressed populations."

The armistice terms as here summarized are those actually signed by the German delegation and by Marshal Foch and Sir Rosslyn Wemyss, the British naval representative. They differ in a number of particulars from those read by the President to Congress, changes having been made after the document had been transmitted to him. It has not yet appeared whether these changes were made by the Supreme War Council at Versailles, which seems to have made the original draft, or in the conference of the German delegates with Marshal Foch.

The execution of the armistice terms began on Tuesday morning, November 12, when German troops commenced the evacuation of Belgium and French territories without the harassing assaults of the Allied troops that had accompanied their retirement but two days before. British and French troops joined with the Belgian forces in following the retiring Germans through Belgium. The Americans were close after the Germans retiring from Metz and the Third American Army, under Gen. Dickman, followed through Luxemburg. Belgian troops occupied Antwerp on November 15. The French were in Metz, under Marshal Pétain, on the 19th.

The next day, November 20, twenty German submarines surrendered to Rear Admiral Tyrwhitt, about thirty miles off Harwich. They were escorted into Harwich where the German crews were transferred to vessels that took them back to Germany. On the 21st the German High Seas Fleet surrendered to Admiral Sir David Beatty, in command of the British Grand Fleet. The vessels surrendered consisted of nine battleships, five battle cruisers, seven light cruisers, and fifty destroyers. On the way across the North Sea one destroyer struck a mine and sank. The British fleet, accompanied by an American battle squadron and French cruisers, received the surrender. They formed a double line of more than 400 war ships, between which the surrendering Germans steamed. There were 60 dreadnoughts, 50 light cruisers and about 200 destroyers in the Allied fleet. Nineteen more U-boats surrendered that same day, and twenty additional the next day. On the 24th 28 more submarines surrendered, including the *Deutschland,* the merchant submarine that made two voyages to the United States in 1916. She brought into Harwich two officers of the American transport *Ticonderoga* which was destroyed by a submarine in midocean in September when the lifeboats, with the escaping crew, were shelled and all but about 25 men out of several hundred killed. The two officers had been picked up by the submarine and taken to Kiel.

The Germans were beginning to cross the Rhine on November 29th, and the French were preparing their formal entry into Strasbourg.

There had been absolutely no diminution of the fighting until the time fixed by the armistice for cessation of hostilities. As the end

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

approached the assaults of the Americans and Allies upon the Germans along the western front grew in vigor and everywhere were increasingly successful. Even after the armistice was signed, and the hour set for terminating hostilities the American Second Army, according to Paris despatches, "attacked in force at 8 o'clock, regardless of the situation. The onslaught was preceded by a tremendous barrage which was returned in kind by the enemy. For three hours the Americans swept forward, hurling themselves against the wire entanglements. The German gunfire was devastating. Then, at exactly one minute of 11 the guns on both sides abruptly ceased."

This kept up the fighting after absolutely nothing but casualties could be accomplished by it. On November 23rd Washington announced that the total of American casualties during the war was 236,117, of which 36,154 were killed in action or died of wounds; 14,811 died of disease; 2,204 unclassified deaths; 179,625 wounded; 2,163 prisoners and 1,160 missing. A week later Washington announced that the total of casualties was 262,723, over 26,000 more than the announcement of the previous week. The lists as furnished to the newspapers will aggregate under 100,000, so that more than three-fifths of our casualties are yet to be published.

Immediately after the signing of the armistice it was reported in Washington that President Wilson was planning to attend the peace conference himself as one of the American delegates. On November 18 formal announcement was made that the President would sail for France immediately after addressing Congress at the opening of its regular session on December 2. It was said that he did not intend to remain long at the conference, but "his presence at the outset is necessary in order to obviate the manifest disadvantages of discussion by cable in determining the greater outlines of the treaty about which he must necessarily be consulted." This announcement produced a ferment of discussion throughout the United States and much opposition developed. The President was oblivious, apparently, to all opposition, and it was announced that he would sail on the transport *George Washington*. Some details of the subsidiary organization of the peace delegation were made public, and on November 29 it was announced that the delegation would consist of the President, Secretary Lansing, Col. E. M. House, Henry White, formerly Ambassador to France, and Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, formerly Chief of Staff of the Army, who has been in Paris as a representative of the United States, since he retired as Chief of Staff. Joseph C. Grew, formerly counsellor of the Embassy in Berlin, has been in Paris for some time organizing the expert economic staff of the peace commission.

Throughout the month there was great confusion in the news reports from Germany, leaving decided uncertainty as to the real state of affairs within the territories of the German Empire. While the armistice delegates were consulting with Marshal Foch at his headquarters their country apparently was crumbling to pieces behind them. A revolt of the German navy was reported on November 8, with the sailors in control at Kiel. Subsequently it was reported that they had mutinied against orders to take the High Seas Fleet out for a final test of strength with the British Grand Fleet. Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils were organized in Hamburg and in several of the Rhine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cities. Reports from various sources told of revolution in Bavaria and the overthrow of the Wittlesbach dynasty which had ruled for 800 years. Demands for the abdication of the Kaiser were reported from many parts of Germany.

Simultaneous despatches from Amsterdam and Basle told of the sending of an ultimatum to the Kaiser by the German Socialist Party. It was said that Philipp Scheidemann handed the document to Prince Max, the Imperial Chancellor. It demanded abdication by the Emperor and renunciation of the throne by the Crown Prince. Other demands included the right of public assembly and the transformation of the Prussian Government in conformity with the views of the Reichstag majority. That day's reports had the Kaiser refusing to abdicate, on the ground that he could not take the responsibility of handing the country over either to the Entente or to anarchy. But the next day Prince Max published a decree saying: "The Kaiser and King has decided to renounce the throne." He did not say that the Kaiser had abdicated, but merely that he had decided to quit. He added that he would remain in office until the questions connected with the abdication and with the renunciation of the throne by the Crown Prince had been settled. The decree implied, but did not state, that Prince Max would serve as regent of the Empire, by saying that "for the regency" he would appoint Deputy Friedrich Ebert, vice-president of the Social Democratic Party, to be Imperial Chancellor, and he proposed a law for general suffrage and a constitutional German National Assembly.

On November 10 came the news that the Kaiser had fled to Holland. He was said to be on his way to Maarn, near which, in the castle of his friend, Count von Bentinck, he expected to find refuge. First reports had the Kaiserin and the Crown Prince with him. Later it was reported circumstantially that the Crown Prince had been shot by his own men. At length the truth became known, that the ex-Empress did not accompany her husband, and that the ex-Crown Prince was practically exiled by being interned, as a German officer, on the island of Wieringen, where he occupies the parsonage at Osterland, a very humble dwelling.

Simultaneously with the flight of Count William Hohenzollern, as he began to call himself, there was a great scuttling of the kings and princes who had ruled over the minor German states. The Socialists demanded that all dynasties in Germany be suppressed and all princes exiled. King Wilhelm II of Wurtemberg abdicated on November 8. The next day the garrison troops in Berlin revolted, and in a few hours the Socialist revolution was in complete control. A Soldiers' and Workmen's Council was formed which took over the city government. Nearly every day brought the report of the abdication or flight of some petty German prince or grand duke.

Immediately after the signing of the armistice Dr. Solf, the German Foreign Secretary, addressed President Wilson by wireless, protesting against the armistice conditions, "especially the surrender of means of transport and the sustenance of the troops of occupation," on the ground that these conditions "would make it impossible to provide Germany with food, and would cause the starvation of millions of men, women and children." Next day the Swiss Minister at Washington presented to Secretary Lansing another German telegram asking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether food would be shipped to Germany provided public order were maintained there. Mr. Lansing replied by citing the President's address to Congress and saying that the President was disposed to present the matter to the Allied Governments. Later a telegram from the National Council of Women of Germany reached Mrs. Wilson, wife of the President. It was largely a paraphrase of Dr. Solf's appeals and used the same arguments, especially about the surrender of railway rolling stock. But in Paris it was pointed out that the rolling stock demanded from Germany would only replace that stolen by German troops from occupied territories. The last of the German daily appeals for food came through on November 15 and then Secretary Lansing sent a wireless reply to Dr. Solf advising him to address all further communications to the Allies.

The proposal that this country should supply food for the Germans and Austrians evoked a storm of protest and criticism, especially from the women whose support of the Food Administration throughout the war had made its success possible. The result of their protest was a statement by Mr. Hoover, the Food Administrator, that no one in the United States would be asked to stint himself in any way in order to supply food for our enemies.

The month closes with the confusion as to actual conditions in Germany not cleared up. But our troops are entering the Rhine lands and the occupation of German territory will soon be completed. Meantime preparations for the peace conference are going forward, and it is likely to be in session before another month ends.

(*This record is as of December 2 and is to be continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

WHY HE VOTED FOR NORRIS

SIR,—I have just read your comment in the November REVIEW on the candidacy of George W. Norris of Nebraska for re-election to the United States Senate. I have read your WAR WEEKLY and the REVIEW right along and can readily see that the action of Nebraska in sending Norris back to Washington must look, to you, something like insanity. So it was, but the insanity must be looked for elsewhere as well as in Nebraska. Some of us helped send Norris back to Washington, open-eyed, knowing what outsiders would think, knowing they would have good cause for thinking ill of us, not knowing fully the causes. None of us, up to date, has expressed any regret, and I apprehend none of us will do so in the future. But I think it is due to Nebraska that judgment should be based upon knowledge of the whole situation as it was when Nebraska voters went to the polls.

I, personally, wrote Mr. Norris, after his foolish and disgraceful disloyal votes and talks in the Senate, that I withdrew every good opinion I had ever had of him and wished I could withdraw every vote I had ever given him. I believe he ought to have been kicked out of the Senate on two counts, imbecility and disloyalty, but I voted for him at the election just the same, after voting against him at the primaries.

Will you please tell me what was left for a self-respecting Republican voter to do? I (when I speak of myself I do so simply because it is easier than to speak of the thousand others who did the same) was in favor of preparedness along rational lines before there was any war. I believed in being reasonably prepared because everybody, except our so-called idealists,—which simply means persons unable to weigh evidence and recognize facts,—knew the danger and knew where it was. Nobody with even ordinary commonsense had any right to be in doubt about it. I believed in preparedness when it was denounced as hysteria, when a War Secretary who believed in it was dismissed and one chosen who naively admitted that he was amazed to learn that every army officer was not spoiling for a fight, in the face of our history which ought to be known to every school boy. I am no hidebound Republican, scarcely ever voting a straight Republican ticket. I was a Progressive and still swear by the Progressive platform, was and am loyal to America to the last gasp, and tried to be loyal to every changing attitude of the Administration because it *was* the Administration, the only Government we had. I saved, urged others to save, paid, subscribed, made speeches, wore old clothes, ate what I could get and tried to be cheerful even when ordered (not requested) to give more,—more time, more money, more sacrifice in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every way, and the orders often coming from someone who had been blind, deaf and dumb to the danger till it was right upon us.

After all that, I thought, being rational and not under tutelage in any way, I might be permitted to vote as I thought best. When told that loyalty required that I vote for Democratic dummies, I simply voted for Republicans, just because they *were* Republicans, something I had never done before, and I did it not out of resentment or anger, but coldly, calmly, calculatedly, because I knew that my duty to self and country required that I do so. I believed from the very first that America ought to be in the war on the side of the Allies with all her force, with all her power, with all her might; and that her power and might ought to be augmented and increased to the limit, yet I voted for a man who showed himself not only disloyal but silly, as the least of two evils. Thousands of others did likewise, and that is part of the explanation for Norris of Nebraska.

But it is not all the explanation, by any manner of means. There is a strong German vote in Nebraska, and that vote went to Norris, as we knew it would. We knew that was partly why Norris voted and acted as he did in the Senate, and you may know something of the feeling among the voters when thousands of upstanding Americans voted with them, as I know they did, Republicans, Progressives, and a great many Democrats. If you think we enjoyed it and have jollified greatly over it, come out to Nebraska and talk with almost any Republican or Progressive. We are not through with Mr. Norris, and if he thinks the vote indicates approval of his course, except by Germans, he would better do some more thinking. And if the Germans in Nebraska think it means any approval of their course in the past, there is going to be a great opening of eyes before long.

Other reasons? Lots of them. Nebraska is progressive, is against the extreme or old-line Republicans with their high tariff, individualistic, corporation-ridden bosses. Nebraska believes strongly in the square deal and the strongest Republican leaders are well in the van of progressive thought. You speak highly of Ex-Governor Morehead. I do not know it to be a fact, but it was very positively and openly asserted by Democratic politicians, who were for Norris, that Morehead in a published interview approved of everything Norris did when the filibuster was on. Morehead is not progressive and Morehead is not able, not in Norris's class in either respect. When the people of Omaha thought they wanted to hitch up the power that gives them water, and get electric light much cheaper, Mr. Morehead thought they weren't even entitled to vote on it, and he vetoed the bill worked through both Houses of the legislature by a former Republican candidate for Governor. The most common term applied to Morehead by forward-looking Republicans and Democrats alike is, "Mossback." When Morehead was Governor, Roosevelt attended a banquet in Lincoln, and Morehead, who presided, had to have the fifty or so words of welcome to a distinguished ex-President typed, and held it before him and read it in the sing-song tones of a schoolboy. This I saw and heard. He is not a man of ability, not a man to captivate or attract at all.

Morehead has always trained with the Hitchcock Democrats, and the Hitchcock Democrats were the pro-German, pro-whiskey Democrats up to very recently. Thinking people find little choice between a man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who speaks out as Norris did and one who has simply taken cover. I am one of those who think Senator Hitchcock did valiant work in jarring Baker out of his peaceful slumbers, but we cannot so soon forget that Hitchcock was believed to play the German game and to have been elected by the German whiskey vote. You see, it isn't all so simple as it looks a couple of thousand miles away. Leaving the war out of the question, thinking men would choose Norris ten to one over Morehead, for ability, for character, for sympathy, for almost anything you wish to name, not excepting candor and straight dealing.

Also there was another reason. Because Morehead was a Hitchcock man, the Bryan Democrats were mainly against him and for Norris. They were naturally for Norris anyway, because Bryan Democrats are natural pacifists. They thought Norris was right, they really believed that when Germany ordered us to stay at home or be shot, we should have meekly stayed at home. Of course they voted for Norris. That didn't make it any easier for aggressive loyalists to vote for him, but we had to do it. Easy? Why, I personally couldn't bring myself to make a cross opposite Norris's name. The only way I could do it was to make a cross in the Republican circle and quit. There were some Democrats on the ticket I would have voted for ordinarily, but I did not feel capable of selecting, because that would have made it necessary to *select* Norris. I was voting Republican because I had been ordered not to do so.

I could go on all day giving excuses. The assininity of the Republicans in putting up at the primaries two men to divide the loyal vote, neither of them acceptable to the great mass of the voters, cut considerable figure. At that, they got almost twice as many votes as Norris at the primaries, showing that, with just a little sense, even the President's letter would not have put Republicans up against such a choice. One thing at a time, however. This is a democratic republic, a constitutional republic. The founders thereof intended a Congress of men, not ninnies or rubber-stamps. When the time came to emphasize that fact, it was done. If in doing it we had to send to Washington a Norris or two, that's a mere incident—one Senator is not very dangerous, no matter how big a fool he may be.

Anyhow, Michigan didn't send Ford. That ought to be sufficient for gratitude this Thanksgiving day.

OMAHA, NEB. H. W. MORROW.

FROM A RETURNING SOLDIER

SIR,—Your article in the October issue entitled, "A Judas Peace," is interesting and truthful, and as I am a returning wounded soldier, I believe I am able to know and speak on it.

The Huns would bomb towns and cities of no military importance, killing civilians and children for no other reason than devilishness.

When the Allies started making reprisals by bombing German towns there was a torrent of abuse cast at us threatening punishment to captured prisoners, and to some extent these threats were carried out.

The Huns were bombing London and they asked their English prisoners what their people thought of the air raids. The prisoners calmly remarked that they were already planning for the protection of London

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against raids. The Germans were very wrathful and fairly foamed in the mouth at this unexpected answer. They thought that they would be frightened into submission by these raids. The Huns do not realize that there is a limit of endurance to what people will stand, as this fact will prove.

My chief reason in writing you is that I have brought home with me a copy of "The American Daily Mail," an English paper sold in France, and your article, "A Judas Peace," tempts me to write you about it. It is as follows:

The Kaiser during his recent visit to Essen made a long speech in which, after expressing his thanks to "his friends of the Krupp works," where he had always admired "German science, inventive talent and creative power," he once more posed as an apostle of peace and tried to throw the onus of the "frightful hatred" shown in the war on German enemies. After a speech of some length the editor has in a space by itself an article by Carol Resemeier, a German in Switzerland, to the Allies.

They will cheat you yet, these Junkers! Having won half the world by bloody murder, they are going to win the other half with tears in their eyes, "crying for mercy."

This is a very shocking admission of what may happen. They all had their fingers in the pie and now when defeat and punishment face them they are trying to get out of it as easily as they can, saying that they are unable to pay.

Trusting this information may be helpful to you,

U. S. General Hospital, The Bronx. Pvt. Walter J. Susat.

IS THE PRESS WILLING TO BE FREE?

Sir,—I have read with considerable interest the article entitled "Muzzling the Press" in the North American Review for November, and I fully agree that the Press of the United States is not free, and unless there is a campaign for the Freedom of the Press it never will be free. In regard to regulations during the war and to be discontinued, I have nothing to say in this letter, but when we fully resume pre-war conditions, the Press will still not be free.

I am opposed to any and all Government interference with our editorials or with our business methods. If there is anything wrong and we are violating laws, an appointive officer should not have the power to ruin our business as judge, jury and executioner, according to his whim and notions, whether right or wrong.

Under the general instructions to carry out provisions of the law, I am opposed to the Post Office Department putting in regulations to beat publishers out of the benefits of the law.

The Reptile Press of Germany was kept under control by subsidy. The American Press is kept under control by regulations that interfere with the minutest details of our business.

We must start a campaign for the Freedom of the Press. We must see that if advertising is to be taxed, all advertising must be taxed. The present taxation of advertising is ingeniously arranged so that only the advertising going into the mails is taxed. The advertising in daily papers is not taxed because they have city delivery of their own.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although in St. Louis, from a competitive standpoint, we are beneficiaries of the zone system, it is another discriminatory law intentionally oppressive.

The campaign for a free press must include the same rate for all and no free service. The special low rates to fraternal and secret societies must be done away with. All American publications should be equal before the law. The only concern of the Post Office Department with publications should be to receive the postage and perform the service paid for.

Another thing must be considered. The Press is not a unit. In my experience the daily is against all other classes, and is satisfied with loss of principle for financial advantage. The weekly paper owners are in favor of regulating monthly publications out of business. The publishers of expensive publications are in favor of the cheap publications not being allowed to use premiums or sample copies that minimize the cost of getting subscriptions; in other words, the Press of the Nation is not altogether *willing* to be free.

ST. LOUIS, MO. H. H. P.

LET THEM LEARN!

SIR,—What is the status of German emigration, as far as America, including Latin America, is concerned? Are Germans who have made their way into Sweden and Norway eligible to enter Latin America at this time, and will the Germans be allowed to enter this country when peace is declared?

This should be prevented.

Bar the Germans from America now and forever. Lock them up in their own land until they pay for their crimes in toil and suffering. Let them learn by experience what they would have inflicted on us, and in a small measure, what they inflicted on France and Belgium. Let them learn what domination means to the dominated. Let them learn the reverse side of "Deutschland über Alles."

NEW YORK CITY. JAY LEWIS.

A DIFFERENCE IN CENSORS

SIR,—I desire to have it understood that my criticisms of the Censorship in my article in the December REVIEW, "The News Embargo," are not intended to include that which Brigadier-General Marlborough Churchill has ably directed from Washington. As for the workings of the amusing Creel bureau, they have been vociferous for themselves and their employers.

COLUMBIA, PA. REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN.

O DEAR, NO

SIR,—You are an expert maker of Presidents, and, as a judge of Presidential material, you grade mighty close to one hundred per cent.

After inflicting all that praise upon you, I want to know what you think of Charles M. Schwab as the next President of the United States.

BOSTON, MASS. THOMAS DREIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED